VOL. XV.

MOSLEM SCHISMS AND SECTS

(Al-Farḳ Bain al-Firaḳ)

BEING THE

HISTORY OF THE VARIOUS PHILOSOPHIC SYSTEMS DEVELOPED IN ISLAM

BY

abū-Manṣūr ‘abd-al-Ḳāhir ibn-Ṭāhir
al-Baghdādī (d. 1037)

TRANSLATED FROM THE ARABIC

BY

KATE CHAMBERS SEELYE

NOTE

The translation of a work from one language into another is always a job more or less thankless. It is difficult to satisfy the masters at each end of the line. This is the case particularly when the languages are as distant philologically one from the other as is English and Arabic. The translator desires to reach lucidity of statement; at the same time he wishes to reproduce his author's words with as felicitous precision as is possible. Between these two ideals he may fail to adjust himself with that nicety that reveals the master hand.

It is not for me to judge in how far Mrs. Seelye has steered clear of the rocks in her path; yet I venture to say that her translation gives a very fair picture of the original. The subject which was the theme of al-Baghdādī—the Conformity or the non-Conformity of Mohammedan religious and philosophic sectaries — is an abstruse one at best. But it has its especial interest. The history of Mohammedan thought, as the theories of the Greek metaphysicians are embroidered on to the dogmas of Islam—is of sufficient interest to the general student of the world's intellectual effort to warrant the attempt to do for al-Baghdādī what has already been done for the two other scholars of his age, Ibn Ḥazm and al-Sharastānī and to render his work accessible to the student who cannot read him in his Arabic original.

In putting out this first part of al-Baghdādī's Compendium, it ought to be remembered that the text as published in 1910 by Muhammad Badr is not in prime condition. It is based upon one single manuscript; and, even with the corrections suggested by the master-hand of Ignaz Goldziher, it does not always inspire in the reader a robust confidence.

In her Introduction, Mrs. Seelye has endeavored to point out the difference in the form of presentation that distinguishes al-Baghdādī from Ibn Ḥazm and al-Sharastānī. We may not care to believe that our author has achieved a wonderful performance; but he has, at least, given us some interesting material. He was learned and a much-read man; and though his point of view is strictly conservative, it is one that has to be taken into account, if we wish to understand the various influences that have moulded the great Mohammedan world. I wish to join Mrs. Seelye in acknowledging the assistance she has received from both Dr. Philip Hitti and Professor Talcott Williams in helping her over many a difficult problem.

Richard Gottheil.

Columbia University, May 31, 1919.

CONTENTS

Note v

Introduction 1

Translation 19

Part I 21
- Chapter I. The Divisions of the Moslem Community 21

Part II. 25
- Chapter I. Explanation of the Idea 27
- Chapter II. The Division into Sects 31

Part III 41
- Chapter I. The Sects of the Rawāfid 43
- Chapter II. The Sects of the Khārijīyah 74
- Chapter III. The Doctrines of the Erring Sects among the Mu‘tazilite Ḳadarīyah 116

Bibliography 211

Index 215

INTRODUCTION

Of Islamic Sects in General

To the student who first looks into the tenets of the Moslem religion, the simplicity of the creed accepted by all who profess Islam, would imply a remarkable unity in this religion. He might at first be tempted to compare it, with favorable results for Islam, to Christianity with its many sects and denominations. Even, when, after a little further study, he found that there was one great schism in Islam, the one which divides the Shiites and the Sunnites, he could still marvel at a religion of but two sects. But once face to face with the tradition, "The Jews are divided into 71 sects, and the Christians are divided into 72 sects, and my people will be divided into 73 sects," his marveling would cease, and his first impulse would naturally be to condemn a religion which justified its schisms by a tradition said to come down from the prophets. The fact of the matter is, that instead of the tradition being invented to justify the sect, the sects have been invented to justify the tradition. In other words, claiming that Mohammed had said that Islam would be divided into 73 sects, many of the theologians of Islam felt it incumbent upon them to bring about the fulfilment of this prophecy, and therefore set to work to make a more or less arbitrary division of the religious system. We must not, however, conclude from this that all but the two sects, the Shiites and the Sunnites, owe their origins to the imaginings of the theologians. Many sects exist which represent important philosophical schools and widely differing trends of thought. It is when these are subdivided, to bring up their number to 73, that the arbitrariness appears.

In his article entitled *Le dénombrement des sectes Mahometanes*, which appeared in the *Revue de l'Histoire de la Religion*, vol. 26, Goldziher offers an explanation for the origin of this rather extraordinary saying attributed to Mohammed. He tells how allusions to this division by European authors are to be found as early as the sixteenth century. Martinus Crucius in his *Turco-Graeciae libri octo*, Bale, 1587, p. 66, says: "Superstitio Mohametana est in LXXII principales sectas divisa, quarum una sola in Paradisum dux est, reliquae vero in inferos." Some traditions give the number as 72 instead of 73. Ibn Māja (d. 283) gives [1] three versions of this saying of the prophet: In one it is only the Jews who, with their 71 sects, are opposed to the future division of Islam into 72 sects, the Christians not even being mentioned; in another, in opposition to the 73 sects of Islam, the Jews are mentioned with 71, and the Christians with 72 sects, of which one shall go to heaven, while the rest are condemned to hell; in the third version, the 71 Jewish sects alone are opposed to Islam. Palgrave suggested that the idea of the 72 sects came from the New Testament account of Our Lord's 72 disciples. Goldziher's suggestion is that this tradition is an erroneous interpretation of a word which originally meant something quite different, this wrong interpretation having changed the primitive form. In other words, "Shu'ab," branches, a term applied very generally to the various ramifications of an idea, came to mean "Firḳah," division, and thus sect. The tradition which has become thus misinterpreted is, according to Goldziher, the one quoted by the great traditionalist Bukhārī [1] (194-256/810-870), "Faith has 60 and some branches, and modesty is one branch of faith" (*Le rec. des trad. Mah.*, ed. Lud. Krehl, vol. i, p. 2). This same tradition appears a little later, as follows: "Faith has 70 and more branches, of which the highest is the belief that there is no God but Allah, and of which the lowest is the taking out of the oath what is to be rejected; and modesty is a branch of faith" (Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, ed. Cairo 1288 A. H., vol. i, p. 126).[2] This use of the word branch gradually came to have the meaning of branching off, dividing; and finally *firḳah* having been substituted for "Shu'ab," we have the tradition of the 72 or 73 sects.

Other rather interesting explanations of this arbitrary division are to be found in Steinschneider's article in *Z. D. M. G.*, vol. iv, p. 147. Here the suggestion is made that it can be traced back to the Jewish tradition about Moses and the 70 elders; that Moses chose six elders from each tribe, except Levi, which being a model tribe would not take offense if slighted, and was therefore asked for only four representatives, Moses himself constituting the seventy-first elder. This number the Mohammedans must increase; and they therefore claim 73 sects. Another view is that the origin is astronomical, while a third derives it from the 70 languages of the Tower of Babel; and a fourth from the 72 letters in Allah's name, a tradition drawn from the Jewish legend of the 72 letters with which Yahweh will free the children of Israel.

Disagreements over this *ḥadīth* have not, however, been limited to the question of the number. One of the greatest points of difference was the question of how many of these

---

[1] Abū-'Abdallāh Muḥammad ibn-Yazīd ibn-Māja al-Ḳazwīnī. *Cf.* Brockelmann, *Arabische Litteratur*, vol. i, p. 163. De Slane, ibn-Khallikān, *Biographical Dictionary*, vol. ii, p. 680.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 594.

[2] One of three great traditionalists of the ninth century. *Cf. ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 391.

sects would be saved. Some held (among them our author, Baghdādī) that all would be damned except one, the orthodox Sunnite sect; others held that all would be saved except one; while still others, and among them leading men, denied the tradition altogether. Of this group, one of the greatest was Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzi the great preacher[1] (d. 1209). In his commentary on the Koran (*Surah* 21, v. 93) he says: "The authenticity of this tradition has been attacked, and it has been observed that if by the 72 sects are meant as many divergencies of the fundamental dogmas of religion, there are not as many existing; but if, on the contrary, it is a question of secondary teachings (derived from these fundamental doctrines), there are more than twice as many. Besides, some are to be found giving quite the opposite of the text which is generally admitted: that all the sects will go to paradise, one only to hell." *Mafātīḥ al-ghaib* [*Keys of the mysterious world*], vol. vi, p. 193. Some others who disregard the tradition go to the other extreme. Makrīzi,[2] for instance, claims that the Rāfiḍīyah are divided into 300 sects. Ibn-Ḥazm holds that many of these sects arose as followers of false prophets, clever politicians and mystics. As an example of the cleverness of some of the leaders, he mentions abū-Mughīth al-Ḥusain al-Ḥallāj,[3] who appeared to his companions as God, to the princes as a Shiite, and to the people as a pious Ṣūfi. In this connection it is interesting to note how often the leader of a new sect is a *maula* or freed slave.

Shahrastānī, Baghdādī, and ibn-Ṭāhir, as orthodox Sunnites cling to the *ḥadīth*, and strive to whip the various sects into line, cutting, inserting, and combining, till they reach

---

[1] Clement Huart, *Littérature Arabe*, p. 317.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 355.

[3] Mystic who was executed in 921 (*ibid.*, p. 269).

the number of 73. Ibn-Ḥazm, on the other hand, disregards the *ḥadīth* altogether.

The various Arab writers who take up the matter of the sects within the "Ummat al-Islām" (the community of Islam) naturally differ in their manner of grouping the sects. Of these writers, the three whom we are going to consider, Baghdādī, Shahrastānī and ibn-Ḥazm, although differing in details, agree more or less in the main divisions. Being orthodox Sunnites themselves, they cannot disagree about that sect. The unorthodox they divide as follows: Shahrastānī groups them under the four main headings: Ḳadarīyah, Ṣifātīyah, Khawārij, and Shiite. Ibn-Ḥazm: Mu'tazilah (much the same as the Ḳadarīyah), Murji'ah, Khārijīyah and Shiite. Baghdādī: Ḳadarīyah, Khārijīyah, Murji'ah, Shiite. In the subdivision of the Shiites, which is the next most important sect to the Sunnites, Shahrastānī gives the following divisions: Kaisānīyah, (4), Zaidīyah (3), Imāmīyah (1), Ghulāt (10), Ismā'īlīyah (1); total 19. Ibn-Ḥazm gives only two subdivisions, the Zaidīyah and the Imāmīyah (or Rāfiḍīyah). Baghdādī: Zaidīyah (4), Kaisānīyah (1), Imāmīyah (15); total 20. The Ghulāt he excludes entirely from the Ummat al-Islām.

This gives a little idea of the differences abounding over this subject, and the more or less arbitrary character of the whole proceeding. A carefully tabulated list of Baghdādī's divisions will be found at the end of this introduction.

As we have already noted, the reasons given for the branching off of the numerous sects vary greatly. Some of the sects are of political origin, others have really to do with some of the fundamental beliefs of Islam, while still others are based merely on quibbling. An example of the greatest political division is to be found in the separation of the Shiites, which was due to the disagreement over 'Alī. The Shiites claim that 'Alī was martyred by Mu'āwiyah and sects would be saved. Some held (among them our author, Baghdādī) that all would be damned except one, the orthodox Sunnite sect; others held that all would be saved except one; while still others, and among them leading men, denied the tradition altogether. Of this group, one of the greatest was Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzi the great preacher[1] (d. 1209). In his commentary on the Koran (*Surah* 21, v. 93) he says: "The authenticity of this tradition has been attacked, and it has been observed that if by the 72 sects are meant as many divergencies of the fundamental dogmas of religion, there are not as many existing; but if, on the contrary, it is a question of secondary teachings (derived from these fundamental doctrines), there are more than twice as many. Besides, some are to be found giving quite the opposite of the text which is generally admitted: that all the sects will go to paradise, one only to hell." *Mafātīḥ al-ghaib* [*Keys of the mysterious world*], vol. vi, p. 193. Some others who disregard the tradition go to the other extreme. Makrīzi,[2] for instance, claims that the Rāfiḍīyah are divided into 300 sects. Ibn-Ḥazm holds that many of these sects arose as followers of false prophets, clever politicians and mystics. As an example of the cleverness of some of the leaders, he mentions abū-Mughīth al-Ḥusain al-Ḥallāj,[3] who appeared to his companions as God, to the princes as a Shiite, and to the people as a pious Ṣūfi. In this connection it is interesting to note how often the leader of a new sect is a *maula* or freed slave.

Shahrastānī, Baghdādī, and ibn-Ṭāhir, as orthodox Sunnites cling to the *ḥadīth*, and strive to whip the various sects into line, cutting, inserting, and combining, till they reach

---

[1] Clement Huart, *Littérature Arabe*, p. 317.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 355.

[3] Mystic who was executed in 921 (*ibid.*, p. 269).

the number of 73. Ibn-Ḥazm, on the other hand, disregards the *ḥadīth* altogether.

The various Arab writers who take up the matter of the sects within the "Ummat al-Islām" (the community of Islam) naturally differ in their manner of grouping the sects. Of these writers, the three whom we are going to consider, Baghdādī, Shahrastānī and ibn-Ḥazm, although differing in details, agree more or less in the main divisions. Being orthodox Sunnites themselves, they cannot disagree about that sect. The unorthodox they divide as follows: Shahrastānī groups them under the four main headings: Ḳadarīyah, Ṣifātīyah, Khawārij, and Shiite. Ibn-Ḥazm: Muʻtazilah (much the same as the Ḳadarīyah), Murji'ah, Khārijīyah and Shiite. Baghdādī: Ḳadarīyah, Khārijīyah, Murji'ah, Shiite. In the subdivision of the Shiites, which is the next most important sect to the Sunnites, Shahrastānī gives the following divisions: Kaisānīyah, (4), Zaidīyah (3), Imāmīyah (1), Ghulāt (10), Ismā'īlīyah (1); total 19. Ibn-Ḥazm gives only two subdivisions, the Zaidīyah and the Imāmīyah (or Rāfiḍīyah). Baghdādī: Zaidīyah (4), Kaisānīyah (1), Imāmīyah (15); total 20. The Ghulāt he excludes entirely from the Ummat al-Islām.

This gives a little idea of the differences abounding over this subject, and the more or less arbitrary character of the whole proceeding. A carefully tabulated list of Baghdādī's divisions will be found at the end of this introduction.

As we have already noted, the reasons given for the branching off of the numerous sects vary greatly. Some of the sects are of political origin, others have really to do with some of the fundamental beliefs of Islam, while still others are based merely on quibbling. An example of the greatest political division is to be found in the separation of the Shiites, which was due to the disagreement over ʻAlī. The Shiites claim that ʻAlī was martyred by Muʻāwiyah and that his descendants alone are to be regarded as legitimate Imāms. By some ʿAlī was even regarded as divine. We read of one sect whose leader having addressed ʿAlī as a God, was put to death by the latter and his following persecuted. Till lately the opinion has been held that the attitude taken by the Shiites with regard to ʿAlī was greatly influenced by Persian mysticism, and the Persian conception of a ruler as more or less divine. This opinion has, however, been questioned by Goldziher. The tendency to regard ʿAlī as a God naturally increased after his death. To the orthodox Sunnite, clinging to the creed, "There is no God but Allah, and Mohammed is the prophet of Allah," such a view is little short of blasphemy. Once divided on this point, these two, the Sunnite and the Shiite, developed apart from each other, and include in the ramifications of their numerous sects almost every conceivable view. The main divisions of the Shiites have already been given; the Sunnites recognize no sects within the orthodox fold, but are divided into the four great schools, each of which recognizes the other. These are the Ḥanifite, the Mālikite, the Shafiite, and the Ḥanbalite.

With such an array of sects as the above statements indicate, we are led to wonder what were some of the causes for disagreement. The average student of Islam is likely to imagine that every Moslem must accept the Koran as infallible. After a glance at some of the Islamic works on sects, however, it is apparent that the only thing upon which all Moslems agree is the creed: "There is no God but Allah, and Mohammed is the prophet of Allah." Everything aside from this has, at some time or other, been attacked by some scholar or leader. If these men limited themselves to attacking or arguing over questions really vital to Islam, such as the necessity for daily prayers, the pilgrimage, the giving of alms, *etc.*, a Mohammedan work

on sects might prove most interesting reading. As a matter of fact, these subjects seem to occupy them far less than their hair-splitting quibbles over the question of whether Allah touches his throne or not, whether a man is a believer, an unbeliever or a heretic, whether an interrupted prayer is acceptable, *etc.* These discussions strongly resemble in pettiness the scholastic debates of the mediæval Christian Church, regarding the number of angels able to stand on a pin-point at one time, or the consequences attending a mouse's eating the consecrated host. The result is rather dull reading, and at times appears not only dull but exceedingly childish.

AL-BAGHDADI

Accounts of Baghdādī's life are to be found in the following works:

De Slane, *Ibn-Khallikān*, vol. ii, p. 149.
Subkī,*Ṭabaḳāt al-Shāfiʿīyah*, vol. iii, p. 238.
Wüstenfeld, *Die Shāfiʿiten*, no. 345; Abhandlung. der Ges. der Wiss. Göttingen, vol. 37, p. 345.
Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arab. Lit.*, vol. i, p. 385.
Friedländer, *J. A. O. S.*, vol. 28, p. 26.
Goldziher, *Vorlesungen über den Islam*, p. 160; *Z. D. M. G.*, vol. 65, p. 349.
Encyclopedia of Islam, under Baghdādī.

Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Ḳāhir ibn-Ṭāhir ibn-Muḥammad al-Baghdādī (d. 329/1037), was, according to ibn-al-Ṣalāḥ, the son of Ṭāhir ibn-Muḥammad al-Baghdādī (d. 283). Subkī, who quotes ibn-al-Ṣalāḥ, however, is not sure of this statement, he merely gives it for what it is worth (Subkī, *Ṭabaḳāt al-Shāfiʿīyah*, vol. ii, p. 228).

ʿAbd al-Ḳāhir was a native of Baghdād, but while still young went with his father to Nīsāpūr where he studied numerous sciences. Subkī, in his long account of him (*Ṭabaḳāt al-Shāfi'īyah*, vol. iii, p. 238), says he was versed in 17 sciences. He became especially famous for his skill in arithmetic, although theology attracted him most. He was a pupil of abū-Isḥāḳ al-Isfarā'inī, whom he succeeded after the latter's death in 418 (1027) as teacher and leader. The revolt of the Turkomans, however, forced him to leave the town in 429 (1037) and take refuge in Isfarā'in. But the joy of the natives of this town at having such an eminent scholar in their midst was short-lived, for he died there that same year and was buried by the grave of his former teacher abū-Isḥāḳ.

Ibn-Khallikān tells us that the *ḥāfiz*, 'Abd-al-Ghaffār al-Fāris, mentions him in the *Siyāḳ*, or continuation of the History of Nīsāpūr, and says: "He came to Nīsāpūr with his father, and possessed great riches, which he spent on the learned (in the law) and on the Traditionalists. He never made his information a source of profit. He composed treatises on different sciences and surpassed his contemporaries in every branch of learning, seventeen of which he taught publicly." The longest account of him is to be found in Subkī's *Ṭabaḳāt*, where almost a page is devoted to a list of his many virtues and accomplishments. His generosity is especially noted; and a rather amusing poem of his, on his poverty-stricken condition due to this generosity is quoted. Subkī divided the followers of the great leader al-Ash'ari (vol. ii, p. 25) into seven ranks, placing Baghdādī in the third rank. Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī[1] also mentions him in his *"Al-Riyāḍ al-Mu'allaḳah"* (*Hanging Gardens*).

According to Subkī's account he was a voluminous writer. In fact, he devotes an entire half-page to a list of his writings, which number nineteen. And even in as long a list as this he omits some which Baghdādī himself mentions in his Farḳ. The following are the most important:

---

[1] Ibn-Khallikān, *ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 652.

> *Al-Farḳ bain al-Firaḳ* (the work under consideration).
> *Kitāb al-Milal wa'l-Niḥal* (book on religions and religious sects).
> *Kitāb Imād fi Mawārīth al-'Ibād* (the laws regarding inheritance of the worshippers).
> *al-Takmilah fi'l ḥisāb* (on mathematics).

To these may be added:

> *Kitāb al ḥarb 'ala ibn-Ḥarb* (against the Mu'tazilite Ja'far ibn-Ḥarb).
> *The Ru'yat Allah*, a dogmatic argument over Surah 75, v. 23.

In his work entitled *Milal wa'l-Niḥal*, now in the Constantinople library, 'Asir Effendi no. 555, he treats in much more detail of some of the sects on which he therefore merely touches in his *Farḳ*.

The manuscript of this work, number 2800 of the Berlin library, is described in Ahlwardt's *Verzeichniss der arabischen Handschriften*, vol. ii, p. 681. He reports the manuscript as untidy, with loose quires and leaves, and a little worm-eaten. Some of the pages in the main part of the book are missing, as well as the end of the fifth chapter of the fifth part.

'Abd al-Ḳāhir al-Baghdādī's work, *Al-Farḳ bain al-Firaḳ*, is based on the tradition we have already mentioned: "There shall be 73 sects in Islam, of which one only shall be saved." Being thoroughly orthodox, he begins by stressing this last point, that one sect alone shall be saved. This sect, the orthodox Sunnites, he treats at the very end of his book.

He divides his work into five parts:

Part one deals with the tradition already mentioned.

Part two, in two chapters, gives a brief treatment of the manner in which the community came to be divided into 72 sects, and a very brief statement of the views of the most important sects.

Part three takes up in eight chapters the opinions of the unorthodox sects, and gives an explanation of the heresy of each.

Part four deals in seventeen short chapters with the sects originating in Islam, but not now found in it.

Part five takes up in five chapters the one orthodox sect.

The beginning of his book, which gives a clear summary of the various sects, short historical sketches, and a certain amount of traditional instances, is quite acceptable reading. When, however, he comes to treat of the philosophical quibblings of many of the sects, he becomes rather hopelessly involved. We cannot, however, give Baghdādī all the blame, for doubtless the apparent senselessness of these quibblings arose with the men whose views he is vainly trying to give us. Whatever the cause, there are undoubtedly times when we are tempted to quote the Arab poet, who, when asked to explain the meaning of some of his poetry, answered: “When those verses were written, two persons understood them, Allah and I; now only one person understands them, Allah.”

In conclusion, it may be rather interesting to compare the different attitudes and methods of the three men who have given us the fullest accounts of the 73 Mohammedan sects. We do not include Shuhfur ibn-Ṭāhir, because his work so closely resembles that of Baghdādī that it is thought by some to be a résumé of the latter's.

‘Alī ibn-Aḥmad ibn-Sa‘īd ibn-Ḥazm ibn-Ghālib ibn-Ṣāliḥ Abū-Muḥhammad was born in Cordova in 384/994. Having been forced out of political life by a change in government, he was compelled to turn from political matters to scholarly ones. And as one of the results we have his great work, *Kitāb al-Milal wa’l-Niḥal*, a part of which Friedländer has translated in his article in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vols. 28, 29. Although an orthodox Moslem himself, he was exceedingly fair and started out by stating that he would never charge an opponent with heresy unless he could justify his charge by a verbal quotation from the opponent's own writing, “be he an unbeliever, a heretic, or a mere sinner, since lying is not permissible against any.” Unfettered by the tradition of the 73 sects, he is able to make logical division of the sects. Friedländer says: “We may safely assume that each name recorded in the *Milal wa’l-Niḥal* represents an historical fact, and not as in the case of all other writers, a mere product of the imagination.” What this author is especially remarkable for is his “breadth of outlook, power of observation, and fairness of judgment.”

Shahrastānī was born in 467 or 479, and died in 548/1153. His work entitled *Kitāb al-Milal wa’l-Niḥal* “has systematic roundness and scientific classification,” but, although he attempts to be fair, and succeeds far better than Baghdādī, there are times when the views of the heretics are too much for even him, and he is forced to give vent to his feelings.

We thus have the three points of view: our author Baghdādī, who starts out by saying that all but the one sect, the orthodox, are condemned to hell fire, and goes on to enumerate all those condemned sects, discussing and opposing their views, and periodically breaking forth in an exclamation of gratitude that “we are not as they”; Shahrastānī, more scholarly, his work more carefully arranged, fairer, trying to be neutral, but at times failing; and Ibn-Ḥazm, absolutely neutral and bound by no hampering traditions.

Since Shahrastānī and Baghdādī represent the more similar treatment, let us consider the two for a moment. The first important thing to note is that Shahrastānī devotes two-thirds of his book to sects outside of Islam. In the first volume one part deals with the 73 sects of Islam, and the second part with some of the religions outside of Islam. The religions treated in the second part are those which possess a Book, and those which have something resembling a revealed book. Under the former he takes up the Jews and Christians, and under the latter the Magians and the Thanawīyah, those who accept two principles. In the second volume he treats of the various philosophies, the Greek, the peripatetic, the Hindu. Some space is given to Buddhism, and many discussions are recounted between Moslem and other teachers and leaders. Baghdādī, on the other hand, merely mentions these other religions in passing, devoting practically the whole of this work to the sects within the Ummat al-Islām. It is likely that he treated these other religions in detail in his *Milal wa'l-Niḥal*, and naturally avoided repetition here. As we have already seen, in the matter of treatment, Shahrastānī merely gives the account of the various sects, and only once in a while expresses his own opinion. Baghdādī, on the contrary, cannot refrain from challenging and criticizing these heretical views, so that at times his history of the sects becomes a polemical discussion. He opens the book with a statement of what he considers constitutes an orthodox Moslem, and although those outside of this pale may have some of the privileges of the faithful, such as being buried in a Moslem graveyard, praying in the mosque, sharing in the booties of Jihād; nevertheless, they may not have prayers said over their bodies, animals slaughtered by them are unclean, and they may not marry an orthodox Moslem. Having thus shown us clearly where he himself stands, he does not hesitate to condemn the heretics—some with rather amusing humor, some with rather biting sarcasm, and others by quick dismissal as not even worth discussing. In fact, the note which runs through the whole part dealing with the orthodox is: " Thank God we are not as they."

Unfortunately, Muḥammad Badr of Cairo, who edited this work, has let pass many errors, many of which Goldziher has corrected in an article in the *Z. D. M. G.*, 1911, vol. 65. Others we have corrected. Many of the Koran references are wrongly numbered, and some of the proper names and sects are incorrect. We should, however, be grateful to him for making this work available to us, even in such an incomplete form. As will be seen, there are several places where the editor himself states that the manuscript was not clear, and in one or two cases there are whole pages missing. A rather amusing error is the one in the table of contents on page 21, where it is stated that the section will be divided into eight chapters. Six only are then enumerated, but in the section eight headings are given. Unfortunately, the manuscript being unavailable at this moment, we cannot say whether this was a slip of the author or of the editor. It is more likely to be the latter.

As to the poem on page 40, it is a long, uninteresting one which has nothing to do with the subject in hand except at the beginning and the end; in the translation, therefore, we have given only the first and last verses.

Table of Sects

- I. Rāfiḍīyah (20)
  - A. Zaidīyah (3)
    - 1. Jārūdīyah
    - 2. Sulaimānīyah or Jarīrīyah
    - 3. Butrīyah
  - B. Kaisānīyah (2)
    - 1. Followers of ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah
    - 2. Muḥammadīyah
  - C. Imamīyah (15)
    - 1. Kāmilīyah
    - 2. Bāḳirīyah
    - 3. The Ghulāt
    - 4. Mubarrākīyah
    - 5. Ḳaṭʻīyah or Twelvers
    - 6. Hishāmīyah
    - 7. Ẓarārīyah
    - 8. Yūnusīyah
    - 9. Shaiṭānīyah
    - 10. Muḥammādīyah *
    - 11. Nawāwīyah *
    - 12. Shumaitīyah *
    - 13. Muʻammarīyah *
    - 14. Ismāʻīlīyah
    - 15. Mūsawīyah

Starred sects are mentioned in the list by Baghdādī but apparently not considered important enough to treat.

- II. Al-Khawārij (20)
  - 1. The first Muhakkamah
  - 2. Azāriḳah
  - 3. Najadah
  - 4. Ṣifrīyah

- 5. ʻAjāridah * (mentions ten in heading, treats eight)
  - a. Khāzimīyah
    - Maʻlūmīyah
    - Majhūlīyah
  - b. Shuʻaibīyah
  - c. The People of Obedience
  - d. Ṣaltīyah
  - e. Akhnasīyah
  - f. Shaibānīyah
  - g. Maʻbadīyah
- 6. Rashīdīyah
- 7. Mukarramīyah
  - a. Ḥamzīyah *
  - b. Shamrakīyah *
  - c. Ibrāhīmīyah *
  - d. Wāḳifīyah *
  - e. Ibaḍīyah
    - Ḥafṣīyah
    - Ḥārithīyah

Khalafīyah and Thaʻālībah are not given in the list but are treated in the chapter.

The starred sects are not treated in the chapter.

- III. Muʻtazilites or Ḳadarīyah (20)
  - 1. Wāṣilīyah
  - 2. ʻAmrīyah
  - 3. Hudhailīyah
  - 4. Naẓẓāmīyah
  - 5. Aswārīyah
  - 6. Muʻammarīyah
  - 7. Iskāfīyah
  - 8. Jaʻfarīyah
  - 9. Bishrīyah

10. Murdārīyah
11. Hishāmīyah
12. Thamāmīyah
13. Jāḥizīyah
14. Ḥāyiṭīyah
15. Ḥimārīyah
16. Khaiyāṭīyah
17. Followers of Ṣāliḥ Kubbah *
18. Musaisīyah *
19. Shaḥḥāmīyah
20. Kaʻbīyah
21. Jubbā'īyah
22. Bahshamīyah

Starred sects not treated in chapter, although mentioned in list. 14 and 15, although in list, are treated under the Ghulāt, that is, those sects which started in Islam but are too heretical to be included in the 73.

IV. Murji'ah (5)
  1. Yūnusīyah
  2. Ghassānīyah
  3. Thaubānīyah
  4. Tūmanīyah
  5. Marīsīyah
V. Najjārīyah (2)
  1. Barghūthīyah
  2. Zaʻfarānīyah
    Mustadrikah
VI. Jahmīyah
  Bakrīyah
  Ḍarārīyah
VII. Karrāmīyah (3)
  1. Ḥaḳāḳīyah
  2. Ṭarā'iḳīyah

  3. Isḥāḳīyah
Total seventy-three.

LIST OF SECTS OUTSIDE OF THE PALE OF ISLAM

Sabābīyah
Ghulāt
  Mughīrīyah
  Bayānīyah
Ḥarbīyah
Manṣūrīyah
Janāḥīyah
Ghurābīyah
Mufauwaḍah
Dhimmīyah
Sharīʻiyah } (of the Rāfiḍīyah)
Numairīyah }

Ḥalūlīyah
Aṣḥāb al-Ibāḥah
Aṣḥāb al-Tanāsukh
Ḥāyiṭīyah (of the Ḳadarīyah)
Ḥimārīyah
Yazīdīyah (of the Khawārij)
Maimūnīyah
Bāṭinīyah

Kate Chambers Seelye.

AL-FARḲ BAIN AL-FIRAḲ

In the name of Allah, the Compassionate, the Merciful! Praise be to Allah, the maker and originator of all Creation, the manifestator and sustainer of truth! He it is who maketh of truth an armor for him who believeth in it, and a source of life to him who relieth upon it. He maketh wrong a stumbling-block to the one who seeketh after it, and a cause of humiliation to him who pursueth it. Prayer and Praise be to the Purest of the Pure, and the Model Guide, Muḥammad, as well as to his kin, the choicest among mortals, the lighthouse of guidance.

Imp

You have asked me for an explanation of the well-known tradition attributed to the Prophet with regard to the division of the Moslim Community into seventy-three sects, of which one has saving grace and is destined for Paradise on High, whilst the rest are in the wrong, leading to the Deep Pit and the Ever-flaming fire. You requested me to draw the distinction between the sect that saves, the step of which does not stumble and from which grace does not depart, and the misguided sects which regard the darkness of idolatry as light and the belief in truth as leading to perdition—which sects are condemned to everlasting fire and shall find no aid in Allah.

Therefore, I feel it incumbent upon me to help you along the line of your request with regard to the orthodox faith and the path that is straight—how to distinguish it from the perverted heresies and the distorted views, so that he who does perish shall know that he is perishing and he that is saved that he is so saved through clear evidence.

The answer to your request I have included in this book, the contents of which I have divided into five parts, to wit:

A chapter in explanation of the tradition transmitted to us concerning the division of the Moslem community into 73 sects.

A chapter dealing with the shame that attaches to each one of the sects belonging to the erring heresies.

A chapter on the sects that are akin to Islām, but do not belong to it.

A chapter on the saving sect, the confirmation of its sacredness and a statement concerning the beauty of its faith.

These are the chapters of the book; in each one of which we shall mention the conclusions that are necessary. So may it please Allah.

PART I

An Explanation of the Well-Known Traditions in Regard to the Divisions of the (Moslem) Community 4

The tradition has come down to us through the following chain of authorities: abū-Sahl Bishr ibn-Aḥmad ibn-Bashshār al-Isfarā'īnī, 'Abdāllah ibn-Nājiyah, Wahb ibn-Baḳiyyah, Khālid ibn-'Abdāllah, Muḥammad ibn-'Amr, abū-Salmah, abū-Hurairah that the last said, the prophet of Allah—peace be unto him[1]—said: "The Jews are divided into 71 sects, and the Christians are divided into 72 sects, and my people will be divided into 73 sects." And we are told by abū-Muḥammad 'Abdallāh ibn-'Alī ibn-Ziyād al-Sumaīdhī, who is considered of interest and authoritative, that he heard through the following chain of authorities: Aḥmad ibn-al-Ḥasan ibn-'Abd al-Jabbār, al-Haitham ibn-Khārijah, Ismā'īl ibn-'Abbās, 'Abd-al-Raḥmān ibn-Ziyād ibn-An'am, 'Abdallāh ibn-Yazīd, 'Abdallāh ibn-'Amr, that the prophet of Allah said: "Verily there will happen to my people what happened to the Banū Isrā'īl. The Banū Isrā'īl are divided into 72 religious bodies, and my people will be divided into 73 religious bodies, exceeding them by one. All of them are destined to hell fire except 5 one." They said: "O, prophet of Allah, which is the one religious body that will escape the fire?" He said:

---

[1] The expression of blessing and peace always follows the name of the Prophet, as well as that of the leading Companions and sheikhs, and the words 'mighty and powerful' the name of Allah. After the first time we will not repeat these devout expressions.

The answer to your request I have included in this book, the contents of which I have divided into five parts, to wit:

A chapter in explanation of the tradition transmitted to us concerning the division of the Moslem community into 73 sects.

A chapter dealing with the shame that attaches to each one of the sects belonging to the erring heresies.

A chapter on the sects that are akin to Islām, but do not belong to it.

A chapter on the saving sect, the confirmation of its sacredness and a statement concerning the beauty of its faith.

These are the chapters of the book; in each one of which we shall mention the conclusions that are necessary. So may it please Allah.

PART I

An Explanation of the Well-Known Traditions in Regard to the Divisions of the (Moslem) Community 4

The tradition has come down to us through the following chain of authorities: abū-Sahl Bishr ibn-Aḥmad ibn-Bashshār al-Isfarā'īnī, 'Abdāllah ibn-Nājiyah, Wahb ibn-Baḳiyyah, Khālid ibn-'Abdāllah, Muḥammad ibn-'Amr, abū-Salmah, abū-Hurairah that the last said, the prophet of Allah—peace be unto him[1]—said: "The Jews are divided into 71 sects, and the Christians are divided into 72 sects, and my people will be divided into 73 sects." And we are told by abū-Muḥammad 'Abdallāh ibn-'Alī ibn-Ziyād al-Sumaīdhī, who is considered of interest and authoritative, that he heard through the following chain of authorities: Aḥmad ibn-al-Ḥasan ibn-'Abd al-Jabbār, al-Haitham ibn-Khārijah, Ismā'īl ibn-'Abbās, 'Abd-al-Raḥmān ibn-Ziyād ibn-An'am, 'Abdallāh ibn-Yazīd, 'Abdallāh ibn-'Amr, that the prophet of Allah said: "Verily there will happen to my people what happened to the Banū Isrā'īl. The Banū Isrā'īl are divided into 72 religious bodies, and my people will be divided into 73 religious bodies, exceeding them by one. All of them are destined to hell fire ex- 5
cept one." They said: "O, prophet of Allah, which is the one religious body that will escape the fire?" He said:

---

[1] The expression of blessing and peace always follows the name of the Prophet, as well as that of the leading Companions and sheikhs, and the words 'mighty and powerful' the name of Allah. After the first time we will not repeat these devout expressions.

"That to which I belong, and my companions." The Ḳāḍī abū-Muḥammad ʻAbdallāh ibn-ʻUmar, the Mālikite, says: "We have it from my father, who had it from his father, that Walīd ibn-Maslamah said that al-Auzāʻī said that we are told by Ḳatādah, who had it from Anas, who had it from the Prophet: 'Lo, the Banū Isrā'īl are divided into 71 sects, and lo my people will be divided into 72 sects, all of them destined to hell fire except one, and these are the true believers.'" ʻAbd al-Ḳāhir says that there are many *Isnāds* (chains of traditions) for the tradition dealing with the division of the community. A number of the following Companions have handed it down as coming from the Prophet: Anas ibn-Mālik, abū-Hurairah, abū-l-Dardā, Jābir, abū-Saʻīd al-Khidrī, Ubai ibn-Kaʻb, ʻAbdallāh ibn-ʻAmr ibn-al-ʻĀs, abū-Imāmah, Wathilah ibn-al-Asḳaʻ and others. It is also handed down that the pious caliphs mentioned that the community would be divided after them, that one sect only would save itself, and that the rest of them would be given to error in this world, and to destruction in the next. Moreover, it is reported of the Prophet that he condemned the Ḳadarites, calling them the Magians of this people. It is also reported that he condemned the Murjiites together with the Ḳadarites. To this is added the report that he condemned the heretics, *i. e.* the Kharijites. While it is handed down from the leading Companions that he 6 condemned the Ḳadarites and the Murjiites and the heretical Khārijites. ʻAlī, Allah have mercy on him, mentions these sects in his Khutbah (sermon) which is known as the Zahrā'; in it he declared himself not responsible for the people of Adīmawāt.[1] Every man of intelligence among the authors of the treatises ascribed to . . . (text not clear) has known that the Prophet in speaking of the divisions that

---

[1] We have been unable to find any explanation for this word.

were to be condemned and the members of which were destined for hell-fire, did not mean the various legal schools, who, though they disagreed as to the derivative Institutes of law, agreed concerning the fundamentals of religion. Now the Mohammedans held two opinions as regards the deductions drawn from the fundamental principles of right and wrong. The first looks with approval upon all those who promoted the Science of derivative Institutes. For it, all the legal schools are right. The second approves, in connection with each derivative Institute, one of the parties contending about it and disapproves all the others—without, however, attributing error to the one who goes astray in the matter. And verily the Prophet, in mentioning the sects condemned, had in mind only those holders of erring opinions who differ from the one sect which will be saved, in such matters as ethics and the unity (of God), promises and threats (regarding future life), predestination and free-will, the determination of good and evil, right guidance and error, the will and wish of God, prophetic vision and 7 understanding, the attributes of Allah, his names and qualities, any question concerning what is ordered and what is permitted, [signs for] prophecy and its conditions, and similar questions in which the Sunnites and the (Moslem) community from among the followers of analogical deduction and tradition agree upon the fundamentals, and in which they are opposed by the holders of erring opinions, namely the Ḳadarīyah, the Khawārij, the Rawāfiḍ, the Najjārīyah, the Jahmīyah, the Mujassimah, the Mushabbihah, and those who follow them[1] among the erring sects. And, verily, those who differ in regard to ethics and the unity (of God), the worship of graves and of ancestors, are agreed in regard to such matters as celestial vision, divine attributes, what is ordained and what is permitted But in regard to the conditions of true prophecy and the Imāmship, some of them accuse each other of unbelief. So that the tradition handed down in regard to the breaking-up of the community into 73 sects must be understood to refer to differences such as these—not to those on which the leading jurists differed in the matter of Institutes drawn from the fundamental principles of right and wrong. Is it not that in those things in which they differ as regards Institutes, it is not at all a question of unbelief or of error? I shall mention in the following chapter the various sects to which the tradition refers concerning the subdividing of the Islamic world, so it please Allah.

---

[1] Not clear in the original.

PART II

THIS part treats of the manner in which this community 8
has been divided into 73. It also contains an explanation of the sects which are collected under the general name of the Millat al-Islām. There are two chapters in this part: one deals with the explanation of the idea underlying the different sects included under the general name of Millat al-Islām; the second concerns the explanation of how the community has become divided, and the enumeration of its 73 sects. I shall mention in each one of these chapters what is necessary, so it please Allah.

divine attributes, what is ordained and what is permitted But in regard to the conditions of true prophecy and the Imāmship, some of them accuse each other of unbelief. So that the tradition handed down in regard to the breaking-up of the community into 73 sects must be understood to refer to differences such as these—not to those on which the leading jurists differed in the matter of Institutes drawn from the fundamental principles of right and wrong. Is it not that in those things in which they differ as regards Institutes, it is not at all a question of unbelief or of error? I shall mention in the following chapter the various sects to which the tradition refers concerning the subdividing of the Islamic world, so it please Allah.

PART II

THIS part treats of the manner in which this community 8 has been divided into 73. It also contains an explanation of the sects which are collected under the general name of the Millat al-Islām. There are two chapters in this part: one deals with the explanation of the idea underlying the different sects included under the general name of Millat al-Islām; the second concerns the explanation of how the community has become divided, and the enumeration of its 73 sects. I shall mention in each one of these chapters what is necessary, so it please Allah.

CHAPTER I

Explanation of the Idea

This chapter explains the idea underlying the expression Millat al-Islām as a general designation of the various sects. Before going into details it is necessary to say that those who belong to Islam are divided in opinion in regard to those to whom the general name of Millat al-Islām is given. Abū-l-Ḳāsim al-Ka‘bī [1] claims in his treatises, "When one uses the expression Ummat al-Islām, it refers to everyone who affirms the prophetic character of Muḥammad, and the truth of all that he preached, no matter what he asserted after this declaration." Others claim that Ummat al-Islām 9
comprises all who acknowledge the necessity of turning in the direction of the Ka‘bah in prayer. The Karrāmīyah, the Mujassimah (corporealists) of Khurāsān, say that the expression Ummat al-Islām comprises all those who enunciate the two parts of the creed. They say everyone who says, "There is no God but Allah, and Muḥammad is the prophet of Allah," is verily a true believer, and belongs to the Millat al-Islām, no matter whether he is sincere or insincere, hiding unbelief and heresy under this assertion. Thus they claimed that those who were insincere in the time of the prophet Allah were really believers, and that their faith was like the faith of Gabriel and Michael and the prophets and the angels, in spite of their joining treachery to their profession of the two parts of the creed. This

---

[1] Haarbrücker's Translation of Shahrastānī, vol. ii, p. 400.

[2] Surah 49, v. 14. *Cf.* Haarbrücker, Shahrastānī, vol. i, pp. 37-38.

opinion, together with the opinion of al-Ka'bī in his explanations of the name of Islām, is refuted by the saying of the 'Īsawīah among the Jews of Ispahan. For verily they accept the prophetic character of our prophet Muḥammad, and the truth of all his teachings. But they claim that he was sent to the Arabs, not to the Banu Israel. They say also that Muḥammad is the prophet of Allah. Nevertheless, they are not numbered among the sects of Islam. And some of the Shārikānīyah[2] among the Jews relate concerning their leader known as Shārikān that he said: "Indeed Muḥammad was a prophet of Allah to the Arabs, and to the rest of mankind, with the exception of the Jews." And also that he said: "The Koran is true and the Adhān [the announcement of prayer], the Ikāmah, the performance of
10 the five prayers, the fast of Ramaḍān, and the pilgrimage of the Ka'bah, all these are truths, but they are prescribed for the Moslems, not for the Jews." Often some of the Shārikānīyah have kept some of these observances. They have professed the two parts of the creed: "There is no God but Allah, and Muḥammad is the prophet of Allah." They have also asserted that his religion is true. Yet, in spite of this, they are not of the Ummat al-Islām, because of their profession that the law of Islam has no binding force upon them. And as regards the saying of one who uses the expression Ummat ul-Islām as a term to be applied to all who see the necessity of turning in prayer to the Ka'bah situated in Mecca, it must be remembered that some of the legalists of al-Ḥijāz have favored this view, but the theoretical reasoners (*aṣḥāb al-ra'i*) rejected it, according to what Abū Ḥanīfah reports, to the effect that he who believes in turning to the Ka'bah in prayer, even if he is in doubt as to its location, is in the right. But the traditionalists

---

[1] Poznanski in *Revue des Études Juives*, LX: 311.

(*aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth*) do not hold the belief that he is orthodox who doubts the location of the Ka'bah, just as they do not accept one who doubts the necessity of turning to the Ka'bah in prayer.

The true view, according to us, is that the Ummat al-Islām comprises those who profess the view that the world is created, the unity of its maker, his preëxistence, his attributes, his equity, his wisdom, the denial of his anthropomorphic character, the prophetic character of Muḥammad, and his universal Apostolate, the acknowledgment of the constant validity of his law, that all that he enjoined was truth, that the Koran is the source of all legal regulations, and that the Ka'bah is the direction in which all prayers should be turned. Everyone who professes all this and does not follow a heresy that might lead him to unbelief, he is an orthodox Sunnite, believing in the unity of Allah. If, to the accepted beliefs which we have mentioned he adds a hateful heresy, his case must be considered. And if he in- 11
cline to the heresy of the Bāṭinīyah, or the Bayānīyah, or the Mughīrah, or the Khaṭṭābīyah, who believe in the divine character of all the Imāms, or of some of them at least, or if he follows the schools which believe in the incarnation of God, or one of the schools of the people believing in the transmigration of souls, or the school of the Maimūnīyah of the Khawārij who allow marriage with one's daughter's daughter or one's son's daughter, or follow the school of the Yazīdīyah from among the Ibāḍīyah with their teaching that the law of Islam will be abrogated at the end of time, or if he permits as lawful what the text of the Koran forbids, or forbids that which the text of the Koran allows as lawful, and which does not admit of differing interpretation, such an one does not belong to the Ummat al-Islām, nor should he be esteemed. But if his heresy is like the heresy of the Mu'tazilites, or the Khawārij, or the Rāfiḍah of the

Imāmīyah, or the Zaidīyah heresies, or of the heresy of the Najjārīyah, or the Jahmīyah, or the Ḍarārīyah, or the Mujassimah, then he would be of the Ummat al-Islām in some respects, namely: he would be entitled to be buried in the graveyard of the Moslems, and to have a share in the tribute and booty which is procured by the true believers in war with the idolators provided he fights with the true believers. Nor should he be prevented from praying in the mosques. But he is not of the Ummat in other respects, namely that no prayer should be allowed over his dead body, nor behind him (to the grave); moreover any animal slaughtered by him is not lawful food, nor may he marry an orthodox Moslem woman. It is also not lawful for an orthodox man to marry one of their women if she partake of their belief. 'Alī ibn abī-Ṭālib said to the Khawārij: "There are three things binding upon us, that we should not start fighting with you, that we should not forbid you the mosques of Allah so that you may mention the name of Allah in them, and that we should not hinder you from sharing the booty as long as your allegiance is with us. Moreover, Allah knows best."

CHAPTER II

The Division into Sects 12

Contains an explanation of the manner in which the Ummat differed, together with an enumeration of the number of its 73 sects.

At the death of the prophet, the Moslems followed one path in the fundamental principles of religion and its deduced corollaries, except in the case of those who agreed in public but in private were hypocrites. The first disagreement came when the people disagreed over the death of the prophet. Some among them asserted that he had not died, and that Allah had only wished to raise him to himself as he had raised 'Īsā ibn-Maryam to himself. This difference ceased, and all were agreed upon his death, when abū-Bakr al-Ṣiddīḳ brought to them the words of Allah to his Prophet: "Verily thou shalt die, and they shall die." He said to them: "Whoever worshipped Muḥammad, verily Muḥammad is dead; whoever worshipped the Lord of Muḥammad, lo verily he is living and dieth not." Then they differed over the Prophet's place of burial, the people of Mecca wishing the body to be taken to Mecca because that was his birthplace, the place of his calling, the place to which he turned in prayer, the place of his family, and there is the grave of his ancestor Ishmael; while the people 13 of al-Madīnah wished him to be buried in that city because that was the home of his flight and the home of his Helpers. Others desired the body to be taken to the Holy Land and be buried in Jerusalem by the grave of his ancestor, Abraham the beloved. This difference, however, ceased when abū-Bakr al-Siddīk related to them on the authority

of the Prophet: "Verily the prophets are buried where they die." They therefore buried him in his chamber in al-Madīnah. After this they differed over the Imāmate. The Helpers (Anṣār) agreed to acknowledge Sa‘d ibn-‘Ubādah al-Khazrajī. But the Ḳuraish said: "The Imāmate must not be, save among the Ḳuraish." Then the Anṣārs agreed with the Ḳuraish because of the saying of the Prophet relating to them: "The Imāms are of the Ḳuraish." But this point of difference has lasted till this day, for the Ḍarār or the Khawārij held that the Imām could come from others than the Ḳuraish. The next difference arose over the affair of Fadak,[1] and over the inheritance of property left by prophets. The decision of Abū-Bakr settled this matter by the tradition coming from the prophet, "Verily the prophets do not bequeath anything." They then differed over the view as to what cancels the obligation of alms. But they finally agreed to the judgment of Abū-Bakr concerning the duty of their warfare. After this they busied themselves making war upon Ṭulaiḥah[2] when he declared himself a prophet and rebelled, until he was driven to Syria. In the days of ‘Umar he returned to Islam and was present with Sa‘d ibn Abī-Waḳḳāṣ at the battle of al-Ḳādisīyah, and after that at the battle of Nahāwand, where he was killed as a martyr. After this they made war on Musailamah, the false prophet, until Allah
14 put an end to his affair and to the affair of Sajāḥ the false prophetess, and also to the affair of al-Aswad ibn-Zaid al-‘Anasī. This over, they turned to the killing of the rest of the apostates, until Allah ended that affair. After this they made war on the Greeks and Persians. And Allah granted them victory. During all this time they were agreed upon

---

[1] Jewish village conquered by Muḥammad.

[2] Ibn-Ḥajar, *Biographical Dictionary of Persons who knew Mohammed*, vol. ii, p. 596.

such questions as ethics, the unity of God, promises and threats, and other fundamental principles of religion. They differed only over the application of the Fiḳh [religious canon], in the cases such as inheritance of the grandfather with brothers, and sisters with fathers and mothers or with the father alone; over questions concerning justice, consanguinity and partnership returns, and whether sisters can be residuary legatees of the father and the mother, or the father with his daughter, or the daughter of a son. They also differed as to the line of relationship and the question of what is forbidden, and such similar questions, differences which do not lead to doctrinal error or immoral acts. They were in this concord in the days of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar and during six years of the caliphate of ‘Uthmān. After this they differed over ‘Uthmān for certain things which he did, for which some blamed him, this blame culminating in his punishment by death. And after his murder they differed over his assassins and those who abandoned him, a divergence of opinion that has lasted until this day. Their next point of difference was over the affair of ‘Alī and the *Followers of the Camel*, over the affair of Mu‘āwīyah and the people of Ṣiffīn, over the judgment of the two judges, abū-Mūsā al-'Ash‘arī, and ‘Amr ibn-al-‘Āṣi; these differences also have endured down to our time. In the time of the later Companions there arose the divergent views of the Ḳadarīyah as to predestination and free will, from the views of Ma‘bad al-Juhanī and of Ghailān al- 15
Dimashḳī and of Ja‘d ibn-Dirham. Among the later Companions who differed from them was ‘Abdallāh ibn-‘Umar, Jābir ibn-‘Abdāllah and abū-Hurairah, and ibn-‘Abbās, and Anas ibn-Mālik and ‘Abdallāh ibn-abī-Aufī and ‘Uḳbah ibn-‘Amir al-Juhanī and their contemporaries. These enjoined their successors not to greet the Ḳadarīyah, nor to pray over their bodies, and not to visit their sick. After

this the Khawārij differed over some things among themselves, and they separated into as many as twenty divisions, each of them condemning the rest as unbelievers. Then it came to pass in the days of al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī that Wāṣil[1] ibn-'Aṭā al-Ghazzāl seceded over the matter of predestination, and also in regard to a middle position between two extremes, and 'Amr ibn-'Ubaid ibn-Bāb went over to him with his heresy. Al-Ḥasan drove them both from his immediate community, and they separated from the rest, taking their place beyond the columns of the mosque of al-Baṣrah. They and their followers were called Mu'tazilah because of their turning from the words of the Ummah in their assertions that a transgressor can be of the Ummat al-Islām and yet neither a believer nor an unbeliever.

Now as to the Rawāfiḍ (or Shia): The Sabbābīyah[2] among them started their heresy in the time of 'Alī. One of them said to 'Alī, "Thou art a God," and 'Alī destroyed some of them by fire, and banished ibn-Sabā to Sābāṭ al-Madā'in. This sect is not one of the divisions of the Ummat al-Islām, because it calls 'Alī a god. Then the Rawāfiḍ, after the time of 'Alī separated into four classes, the 16 Zaidīyah, the Imāmīyah, the Kaisānīyah and the Ghulāt. These in turn further subdivided, each sect condemning the rest. All of the subdivisions of the Ghulāt are outside of the pale of Islam. But the subdivisions of the Zaidīyah and of the Imāmīyah are still considered among the sects of the Ummah. The Najjārīyah in the neighborhood of al-Rai separated after the time of al-Za'farānī into sects which con-

---

[1] Shahrastānī incorrectly has *Wafzil.*

[2] Saba'īyah—became Sabbabīyah (denouncers) because of their attitude toward 'Alī. Ibn-Saba was said to be a Jew, "outwardly confessing Islam in order to beguile its adherents." Ibn-Ḥazm, *Kitāb al-Milal wa'l-Niḥal*, tr. in part by I. Friedländer, J. A. O. S., vol. xxviii, p. 37. Treated more fully by Shahrastānī, Haarbrücker, vol. i, p. 200.

demned each other. The secession of the Bakīrīyah was due to Bakr, the nephew of 'Abd al-Wāḥid ibn-Ziyād; the secession of the Darārīyah to Dārar ibn-'Amr; and that of the Jahmīyah to Jahm ibn-Ṣafwān. Jahm and Bakr and Dārar declared their views when Wāṣil ibn-'Aṭā brought forth his errors, and the propaganda of the Bāṭinīyah appeared in the days of the (Caliph) al-Ma'mūn at the hands of Ḥamdān Ḳarmaṭ and 'Abdallāh ibn-Maimūn al-Ḳadāḥ. The Bāṭinīyah, however, do not belong to the sects of Islam, but rather to the sects of the Magians, as we shall show later. They appeared in the days of Muḥammad ibn-Ṭāhir ibn-'Abdallāh ibn-Ṭāhir in Khurāsān, in contrast to the Karrāmīyah, the corporealists.

The Zaidīyah from among the Rawāfiḍ were divided into three sects, the Jārūdīyah and the Sulaimānīyah, and some add the Ḥurairīyah and the Butrīyah; these three sects being held together by their doctrine of the Imāmship of Zaid ibn-'Alī ibn-al-Ḥusain ibn-'Alī ibn-abī-Ṭālib when he revolted. This was at the time of Hishām ibn-'Abd al-Malik. One part of them, the Kaisānīyah, represent numerous divisions, but they all can be included in two sects, one of which claimed that Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah was still alive, that he had not died, that they awaited his 17 coming, claiming that he was the expected Mahdī. While the second of these sects agreed with them as to his Imāmate while he was alive, and at the time of his death, after his death they transferred the Imāmate to someone else. After this, further, they differed over the one to whom the Imāmate is transferred.

The Imāmīyah who [at first] had separated into the Zaidīyah, the Kaisānīyah[1] and the Ghulāt, later formed fifteen sects, viz., al-Muḥammadīyah, al-Bāḳirīyah, al-Nāwisīyah, al-Shumaiṭīyah, al-'Ammārīyah, al-Ismā'īlīyah, al-Mubārakīyah, al-Mūsawīyah, al-Ḳiṭa'īyah, the Ithna 'Asahrīyah (the Twelvers), al-Hishāmīyah, the followers of Hishām ibn-al-Ḥakam, or of Hishām ibn-Sālim al-Jawālīḳī, al-Zarārīyah, followers of Zarārah ibn-A'yun, al-Yūnusīyah followers of Yūnus al-Ḳummī, al-Shaiṭānīyah followers of Shaiṭan al-Ṭāḳ, al-Kāmilīyah followers of abū-Kāmil, who was the most severe in condemning 'Alī and the rest of the Companions. These are the twenty sects springing from the Rawāfiḍ; of these, three are Zaidīyah and two Kaisānīyah, with fifteen sects of the Imāmīyah.

---

[1] Text: "Kisā'īyah"; but see Shahrastānī, p. 165.

The Ghulāt among them, however, who hold to the divine character of the Imāms and sanction those things forbidden of the Canon law and reject its obligatory character, as for example the Bayānīyah, the Mughīrīyah, the Janāḥīyah, the Manṣūrīyah, the Khaṭṭābīyah, the Ḥalūlīyah, and those who hold similar views, are not of the sects of Islam although they claim adherence to it. These we shall mention in a separate part following this one.

Now when differences arose among the Khawārij they split up into the twenty following sects: The first Muḥakkimah, 18 the Azāriḳah, the Najadāt, the Ṣifrīyah, the 'Ajāridah, the latter splitting up into numerous sects, namely: the Khāzimīyah, the Shu'aibīyah, the Ma'lūmīyah, the Majhūlīyah, the Ma'badīyah, the Rashīdīyah, the Mukarramīyah, the Ḥamzīyah, the Ibrāhīmīyah, the Wāḳifah, and the Abāḍīyah who in turn split into the Ḥafṣīyah, the Ḥārithīyah, the Yazīdīyah, and the Followers of Obedience which is not intended for Allah; of these the Yazīdīyah are the followers of ibn-Yazīd ibn-Unais, and are not of the sects of Islam because they say that the law of Islam will become annulled at the end of time by a prophet sent from Persia. The same is the case of the 'Ajāridah, of whom there is a sect called the Maimūnīyah, which was not of the

sects of Islam because it sanctioned the marriage with daughters of daughters and with daughters of sons just as the Magians sanction it. We will mention the Yazīdīyah and the Maimūnīyah among those who are derived from Islam, but are not of it, nor of its sects.

The Ḳadarīyah, the departers from truth, split up into twenty sects, each one condemning the rest. These are their names: the Wāṣilīyah, the 'Amrīyah, the Hudhailīyah, the Niẓāmīyah, the Amwārīyah, the 'Umarīyah, the Thumāmīyah, the Jāḥizīyah, the Ḥāyiṭīyah, the Ḥimārīyah, the Khaiyāṭīyah,[1] the Saḥāmīyah, the followers of Ṣāliḥ Ḳubbah, the Mūwaisīyah, the Ka'bīyah, the Jubbā'īyah, the Bahshamīyah, who were founded by abū-Hāshim ibn-al-Jubbā'ī. These are the twenty-two sects; two of them do not belong to the sects of Islam, *i. e.* the Ḥāyiṭīyah and the Ḥimārīyah. We shall mention them among the sects which are derived from Islam but do not belong to it.

19 Three classes are to be distinguished among the Murji'ah: one of these classes believes in disobedience in matters of faith and in predestination, according to the belief of the Ḳadarīyah. They are therefore counted among the Ḳadarīyah and the Murji'ah like abū-Shimr al-Murjī', Muḥammad ibn-Shabīb al-Baṣrī and al-Khālidī. The second of these classes believes in disobedience in matters of faith, but are inclined toward the view of Jahm as to deeds and works. These are all Jahmīyah and Murji'ah. The third class accepted the view in regard to disobedience, but did not accept the doctrine of predestination. It formed five sects: the Yūnusīyah, the Ghassānīyah, the Thaubānīyah, the Taumanīyah, and the Marīsīyah. The Najjārīyah comprise to-day in the city of al-Rai more than ten sects, although they are originally no more than three sects:

---

[1] Haarbrücker's Shahrastānī, vol. i, p. 79.

the Burghūnīyah, the Za'farānīyah, and the Mustadrikah. The Bakrīyah and the Ḍirarīyah each form one sect. They do not have numerous followings. The Jahmīyah also form one sect. The Karāmīyah in Khurāsān form three sects, the Ḥaḳāḳīyah, the Ṭarāiḳīyah, and the Isḥāḳīyah. These three sects, however, do not condemn each other. We therefore regard them all as a single sect. All these that we have mentioned make up the seventy-two sects; of them twenty are Rawāfiḍ, twenty Khawārij, twenty Ḳadarīyah and ten Murji'ah; three of them are Najjārīyah, including the Bakrīyah and the Ḍirārīyah, the Jahmīyah and the Karramīyah; and these are the 72 sects. The 73d sect, the orthodox, is composed of the two classes of the theorists and the traditionalists, except those who deal lightly with tradition. The legalists of these two groups Jwp
20 and the Koran readers, traditionalists, and the philosophers among the followers of tradition, all are united in the one opinion as to the unity of the creator and his attributes, his justice and his wisdom, his names and his qualities; also in regard to prophecy and Imāmate, and the doctrines of retribution, and the rest of the fundamentals of religion. They differ only over that which is permitted and that which is forbidden in the deductions from the fundamental doctrines. In the things in which they differ there is nothing that can cause them to err, or lead them astray. They form the [great] body of those who will be saved. They are united by the firm belief in the unity of the creator and in his eternity, the eternity of his unending attributes, the possibility of having visions of Him, without falling into the error of anthropomorphism or atheism, and in acknowledging the books of Allah and his prophets, the authority of the law of Islam, the permitting of that which the Koran permits and the forbidding of that which the Koran forbids, as well as the holding of those traditions of the prophets of

Allah which are trustworthy, the belief in the last day and the resurrection, the questioning of the two angels in the grave, and the belief in the pool (*al-ḥauḍ*) and the balance.[1] He who holds the above-mentioned doctrines, not mixing with his beliefs any of the heresies of the Khawārij, and the Rāfiḍīyah and the Ḳadarīyah and the rest of the unorthodox; such a one belongs to those who are to be saved; may Allah preserve him in his belief. The majority of the Mohammedans are of this character, the greater number of whom are of the followers of Mālik and Shāfi'ī, and abū-Ḥanīfah and al-Auzā'ī and al-Thaurī and the Ahl al-Ẓāhir. This then explains what we desired to explain in this part. In the part which follows we shall mention the divisions of the opinion of each sect of the heretical sects which we have mentioned, so it please Allah.

---

[1] Surah 108, 1-3; Surah 42, 6; 21, 47.

PART III

AN explanation of the various opinions of the heretical 21 sects and a detailed explanation of the heresies of each sect. This chapter contains eight sections, of which the following are the titles:

I. An explanation of the opinions of the sects of the Rāfiḍah.
II. An explanation of the opinions of the sects of the Khawārij.
III. An explanation of the opinions of the sects of the Mu'tazilah and the Ḳadarīyah.
IV. An explanation of the opinions of the sects of the Ḍirārīyah, Bakrīyah and Jahmīyah.
V. An explanation of the opinions of the sect of the Karāmīyah.
VI. An explanation of the opinions of the anthropomorphists, found among the numerous sects which we have mentioned.[1]

In each of these chapters we shall mention what it is necessary to note, so it please Allah.

---

[1] Two left out . . . IV. Murji'ah and V. Najjārīyah.

CHAPTER I

22

THE SECTS OF THE RAWAFID

This chapter explains the opinions of the sects of the Rawāfiḍ.[1]

As we have already noted, the sect of the Zaidīyah was divided into three sects, the Kaisānīyah into two, and the Imāmīyah into fifteen. We shall begin by treating of the Zaidīyah, then take up the Imāmīyah and then the Kaisānīyah in regular order, so it please Allah.

1. Concerning the Jārūdīyah from among the Zaidīyah. These are the followers of a man known as abū'l-Jārūd.[2] They claim that the Prophet designated 'Alī as Imām by his characteristics,[3] but not by name. They also claim that by ceasing to recognize 'Alī, the Companions became unbelievers. Moreover, they say that al-Ḥasan ibn-'Alī was Imām after 'Alī, and was followed by his brother al-Ḥusain. Over this matter the Jārūdīyah split into two sects. One sect said: "Verily 'Alī designated as Imām his son al-Ḥasan, then al-Ḥasan designated as Imām after him his brother al-Ḥusain. After al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusain, the Imāmate became a matter of conference among the children of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusain"; the one of them who went forth from them (by their decision), unsheathing his sword and summoning to his faith, and at the same time was wise and godly, he was to be the Imām. The other sect asserted

---

[1] For term Rāfiḍīyah *cf.* J. A. O. S., vol. xxix, p. 137.

[2] His full name is abū-'l-Jārūd Ziyād ibn-al-Mundhir al-'Abdī. Mas'ūdi, *Les Prairies d'Or*, vol. v, p. 474; Friedländer, J. A. O. S., vol. xxix, p. 22.

[3] Shahrastānī gives description: Ibn-Ḥazm omits question of Imāmship.

CHAPTER I

22

THE SECTS OF THE RAWAFID

This chapter explains the opinions of the sects of the Rawāfiḍ.[1]

As we have already noted, the sect of the Zaidīyah was divided into three sects, the Kaisānīyah into two, and the Imāmīyah into fifteen. We shall begin by treating of the Zaidīyah, then take up the Imāmīyah and then the Kaisānīyah in regular order, so it please Allah.

1. Concerning the Jārūdīyah from among the Zaidīyah.

These are the followers of a man known as abū'l-Jārūd.[2] They claim that the Prophet designated 'Alī as Imām by his characteristics,[3] but not by name. They also claim that by ceasing to recognize 'Alī, the Companions became unbelievers. Moreover, they say that al-Ḥasan ibn-'Alī was Imām after 'Alī, and was followed by his brother al-Ḥusain. Over this matter the Jārūdīyah split into two sects. One sect said: "Verily 'Alī designated as Imām his son al-Ḥasan, then al-Ḥasan designated as Imām after him his brother al-Ḥusain. After al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusain, the Imāmate became a matter of conference among the children of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusain"; the one of them who went forth from them (by their decision), unsheathing his sword and summoning to his faith, and at the same time was wise and godly, he was to be the Imām. The other sect asserted

---

[1] For term Rāfiḍīyah *cf.* J. A. O. S., vol. xxix, p. 137.

[2] His full name is abū-'l-Jārūd Ziyād ibn-al-Mundhir al-'Abdī. Mas'ūdi, *Les Prairies d'Or*, vol. v, p. 474; Friedländer, J. A. O. S., vol. xxix, p. 22.

[3] Shahrastānī gives description: Ibn-Ḥazm omits question of Imāmship.

that the Prophet was the one who designated al-Ḥasan as
23 Imām after 'Alī, and al-Ḥusain after al-Ḥasan. After this, the Jārūdīyah split over the question of the expected Imām. One of their sects refrained from specifying any definite Imām, holding that everyone among the children of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusain who "unsheathes his sword and summons to his faith, he is the Imām." Others awaited Muḥammad ibn-'Abdallāh ibn-al-Ḥasan ibn-'Alī ibn-abi-Ṭālib. They would not believe that he had been slain, or that he had died, but claimed that he was the expected Mahdī who would come to reign over the world. This group joined with the Muḥammadīyah from the Imāmīyah in looking for Muḥammad ibn-'Abdallāh ibn-al-Ḥasan ibn-'Alī as the expected Imām. Others awaited Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḳāsim, the master of Ṭālaḳān,[1] and did not believe in his death. Still others looked for Muḥammad ibn-'Umar, the one who appeared in al-Kūfah, refusing to believe that he was slain or had died. This is the doctrine of the Jārūdīyah. Their own heresy is proven by the fact that they declared the Companions of the Prophet of Allah to be heretics.

2. Concerning the Sulaimānīyah [2] or the Jarīrīyah from among them.

These followed Sulaimān ibn-Jarīr al-Zaidī, who said that the Imāmate was a matter of conference and could be confirmed by an agreement between two of the best men in Islam. He went so far as to claim as lawful the Imāmate of a person even when possibly excelled by the other. He, however, sanctioned the Imāmate of abū-Bakr and 'Umar, although he claimed that Islam forsook the right path when it invested them [with the caliphate], because 'Alī was

---

[1] Shahrastānī, Haarbrücker's translation, vol. i, p. 179.

[2] Longer account in *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 180.

more eligible to the Imāmate than they. The sin of their recognition, however, did not, according to him, constitute heresy or apostacy. Sulaimān ibn-Jarīr declared unorthodox those who reproved him, while the orthodox in turn called Sulaimān ibn-Jarīr unorthodox because he considered 'Uthmān unorthodox. Allah have mercy on him. 24

3. Concerning the Butrīyah.

These followed two men,[1] one of whom was al-Ḥasan ibn-Ṣāliḥ ibn-Ḥai, and the other Kathīr al-Munauwa, who is called al-Abtar. They agreed with Sulaimān ibn-Jārīr of this group, differing from him only in that they did not commit themselves about 'Uthmān, neither attacking his faults nor praising his virtues. Of the followers of Sulaimān ibn-Jarīr, this sect is the best thought of by the orthodox. Muslim ibn-al-Ḥajjāj [2] has cited the tradition of al-Ḥasan ibn-Ṣāliḥ ibn-Ḥai in his collection called *al-Saḥīḥ*. Muḥammad ibn-Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī,[3] although not citing him in his *al-Saḥīḥ*, does say in his work entitled *al-Ta'rīkh al-Kabīr* that al-Ḥasan ibn-Ṣāliḥ ibn-Ḥai al-Kūfi was the pupil of Sammāk ibn-Ḥarb and died in the year 167. He was from the border-line of Hamadhān and his surname was abū-'Abdallāh.

'Abd-al-Ḳāhir says: These Butrīyah and Ṣulaimānīyah from among the Zaidīyah, all of them called the Jārūdīyah, of the Zaidīyah, unorthodox, because they affirmed the heresy of abū-Bakr and 'Umar. The Jārūdīyah affirmed the Sulaimānīyah and Butrīyah heretics because they left uncondemned the heresy of abū-Bakr and 'Umar. Our sheikh, abū-l-Ḥasan al-Ash'ari,[4] in one of his treatises tells of a section of the Zaidīyah called the Ya'ḳūbīyah, followers of

---

[1] Shahrastānī makes these two sects.

[2] De Slane, Ibn-Khallikān, vol. iii, p. 348.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 594.

[4] *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 227.

a man called Ya‘ḳūb, and states that they had accepted abū-
25 Bakr and ‘Umar, but they did not reject those who rejected the caliphate of the two latter. ‘Abd-al-Ḳāhir says that three of the sects of the Zaidīyah that we have mentioned agreed on the view that those who commit major sins within Islam would be forever in hell fire. In regard to this they resemble the Khawārij, who give no hope of Allah's grace to prisoners of sin even though they be believers, whereas none but the unbelievers need really despair of the spirit[1] of Allah. These three sects and their followers are called Zaidīyah because of their acceptance of the Imāmate of Zaid ibn-‘Alī ibn-al-Ḥasan ibn-‘Alī ibn-abi-Ṭālib, in his time and the Imāmate of his son, Yaḥya ibn-Zaid, after him. Zaid ibn-‘Alī was recognized as Imām by fifteen thousand men of the people of al-Kūfah who went with him against the governor of al-‘Irāḳ, Yūsuf ibn-‘Umar al-Thaḳafī, governor over the two ‘Irāḳs under Hishām ibn-‘Abd-al-Malik. And when the war between him and Yūsuf ibn-‘Umar al-Thaḳafī had lasted some time, they said unto him: "We will help thee against thine enemies after thou hast told us thy views regarding abū-Bakr and ‘Umar who were unjust to thine ancestor ‘Alī ibn-abi-Ṭālib." Zaid said: "I say naught against them except good, and I have never heard my father say anything except good of them, and I have set out against the Banu Umaiyah only because they fought against my ancestor al-Ḥusain and attacked al-Madīnah on the day of al-Ḥarrah. They then demolished the Beit Allah with ballista and fire." Whereupon they deserted him [Zaid], who said to them: "Do you desert me also?" And from this day on they were called the Rāfiḍah [Deserters]. There then remained with him Naṣr ibn-Ḥarīmah al-‘Ansī and Mu‘āwīyah ibn-Isḥāḳ ibn-Yazīd ibn-Ḥārithah with about two hundred men,
and they fought the army of Yūsuf ibn-‘Umar al-Thaḳafī 26
until they were all killed, including Zaid. He was afterwards exhumed, crucified, and burned. His son Yaḥya ibn-Zaid fled to Khurāsān, and rebelled in the district of Jūzājān against Naṣr ibn-Bashshār, the governor of Khurāsān, who sent against him Muslim ibn-Ahwaz al-Māzinī with three thousand men, and they killed Yaḥya ibn-Zaid. His shrine in Jūzājān is famous. ‘Abd-al-Ḳāhir says that the Rawāfiḍ of al-Kūfah are remarkable for perfidy and stinginess, so that a proverb has become current in regard to these qualities among them and the saying has grown up: "More stingy than a Kūfite and more perfidious." Three instances of their perfidy have become widely known. First, after the slaying of ‘Alī, they recognized al-Ḥasan his son, but when he went to fight against Mu‘āwīyah, they seized him by treachery in Sābāṭ al-Madā'in and Sanān al-Ju‘fī, one of their number, pierced his side and threw him from his horse; and this was one of the reasons for the peace made with Mu‘āwīyah. The second instance of their perfidy was that they wrote to al-Ḥusain ibn-‘Alī and invited him to come to al-Kūfa so that they should help him against Yazīd ibn-Mu‘āwīyah. He allowed himself to be deceived by them, and accepted their invitation, but when he reached Karbelā', they seized him by treachery and made common cause with ‘Ubaidallāh ibn-Ziyād so that al-Ḥusain was killed in Karbīlā', together with many of his family. Their third perfidy was against Yazīd ibn-‘Alī ibn-al-Ḥusain ibn-‘Alī ibn-abi-Ṭālib, for after going out with him against Yūsuf ibn-‘Umar they broke their word to him [Yazīd], which resulted in his being killed, and there befell what befell.

4. Concerning the Kaisānīyah from among the Rawāfiḍ. 27
These are the followers of al-Mukhtār ibn-abī-‘Ubaid

---

[1] The Arabic word used, denotes wind which brings relief.

al-Thaḳafī[1] who undertook to avenge the death of al-Ḥusain ibn-‘Alī ibn-abi-Ṭālib. He killed most of those who had killed al-Ḥusain at Karbilā’. He was al-Mukhtār, but he was called Kaisān. It is reported that he took his opinions from a freedman who belonged to ‘Alī, whose name was Kaisān.[2] The Kaisānīyah split up into sects, to which two opinions are common; one of them is the Imāmate of Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah, whom al-Mukhtār ibn-abi-‘Ubaid was accustomed to champion. The second [upon which they agreed] was that Allah might have had a beginning. Because of this heresy everyone who does not accept this doctrine about Allah, accuses them of being unorthodox. These Kaisānīyah split over the Imāmate of Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah. Some of them claimed that he became Imām after his father ‘Alī ibn-abī-Ṭālib, proving this by the fact that ‘Alī, at the battle of the Camels, gave over the banner to him,[1] and said: "[Carrying this, attack] as thy father would attack, then thou wilt be praised. There is no good in war which does not rage." Others held that the Imāmate after ‘Alī went to his son al-Ḥasan, then to al-Ḥusain, after al-Ḥasan, and then passed over to Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah after his brother al-Ḥusain, by the last will of his brother al-Ḥusain, at the time when he fled from al-Madīnah to Mecca, when his allegiance was sought for Yazīd ibn-Mu’āwīyah. This resulted in the splitting off of those who hold to the Imāmate of Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah. Some of those who are called al-Karibīyah are followers of abū-Karib al-Ḍarīr and claim that Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah is living and did not die, 28 that he is in Mt. Raḍwa, and near him is a fount of water and a fount of honey, from which he derives his sustenance, while at his right, a lion, and at his left a panther guard him from his enemies until the time of his appearance.[1] He is the expected Mahdi. The rest of the Kaisānīyah believe in the death of Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah but disagree about the Imām who should succeed him. There were some of them who claimed that the Imāmate after him reverted to the son of his brother, ‘Alī ibn-al-Ḥusain Zain al-‘Ābidīn, while others hold that after him it should revert to abū-Hāshim ‘Abdallah ibn-Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah, so these split over the Imām to succeed abū-Hāshim. Some transfer the Imāmate to abū-Muḥammad ibn-‘Alī ibn-‘Abdallāh ibn-‘Abbās ibn-‘Abd-al-Muṭṭalib, because abū-Hāshim willed it to him. This latter is the view of the Rawandīyah. Others claimed the Imāmate after abū-Hāshim went to Bayān ibn-Sim‘ān, and they hold that the spirit of Allah was in abū-Hāshim, and passed over from him to Bayān. While some claimed that this spirit passed from abū-Hāshim to ‘Abdallāh ibn-‘Amr ibn-Ḥarb. This sect claims the divine character of the latter. As to the Bayānīyah and the Ḥarbīyah, both of them belonging to the Ghulāt sects, we shall mention them in the section in which we mention the sects of the Ghulāt. Kuthaiyir, the poet, was of the school of the Kaisanīyah who hold that Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah is alive, and do not believe in his death. He says in his poem:[2]

"Indeed, the Imāms of the Ḳuraish, the masters of truth, are four alike. 29
‘Alī and his three sons, they are the sires about whom there is naught hid.
One sire is the sire of faith and piety, and the other sire Karbelā reft from sight.[3]

---

[1] J. A. O. S., vol. xxix, p. 33. Shahrastānī gives two sects, Kaisānīyah and Mukhtārīyah. This sect is sometimes even classed under the Imāmīyah. *Cf.* Ibn-Ḥazm's division.

[2] Ibn-Khallikān, De Slane, vol. ii, p. 577.

[1] On the part of animals in Messianic ideals see Friedländer, J. A. O. S., vol. xxix, p. 37 ff.

[2] *Kitāb al-Aghāni* 8, 32. Mas‘ūdi, *Les Prairies d'Or,* vol. v, p. 182. Ibn-Ḳutaibah ed. De Goeje, p. 329.

[3] Mas‘ūdi gives it "Hidden from all sight."

And a third does not taste death until he leads the horsemen, the banner preceding,
He disappeared and was not seen among them for a season, hidden in Raḍwā, near him are honey and water." [1]

'Abd-al-Ḳāhir answers these verses with the words:

"The masters of truth are four, but as to the second of the two, his fame has preceded him,
And Fārūḳ, of the world, appeared as Imām, following him Dhū'l Nūnain who met his death.
'Alī appeared after them as Imām, in the order in which I have given them.
The decree came from above, and hateful are they whom we mention as accursed.
To the fire of hell have they been relegated, and the sectaries are a people like unto the Christians,
Confused ones, for their confusion there is no healing."

And Kuthaiyir also said about sectaries: [2]

"I am free to go to Allah, and free from connection with ibn Arwā, and free from the religion of the Khawārij.
And free from 'Umar and Abū-Bakr, at the time when he was declared *emir of the faithful.*"

These verses we have answered with the following:

"Thou art indeed free, but from Allah, through the hatred of the people, through whom Allah has kept alive the faithful.
And hatred of thine harms not ibn-Arwā, the hatred of piety is the religion of the unbelievers.
Abū-Bakr, I rejoice in him as Imām, despite all the anger of the Rawafiḍ.
30 'Umar, the Fārūḳ of the world, is rightly called the *emir of the faithful.*"

[Saiyid says: [3]]

"Say to al Waṣy: 'I would give my life for thee, thou hast stayed in this mount a long time,
They persecute in the community those of us who follow thee, and who proclaim thee caliph and Imām.

---

[1] De Slane, Ibn-Khallikān, vol. II, p. 577.

[2] Ibn-Ḳutaibah, *ibid.*, p. 316. Ibn Arwā = Uthmān.

[3] Mas'ūdi, *Les Prairies d'Or*, vol. v, p. 182.

And all the people of the earth were inimical to thee during thy stay with them for sixty years.
The son of Khawla [name of the Ḥanifīte mother of Muḥammad] has not tasted of death, and the earth does not hold his bones.[1]
And verily he has the sustenance of an Imām, and drink is provided and with it food.'"

This poem we answered with the words:

"Lo thy life has passed in waiting, for the one whose bones the ground holds.
And there is no Imām in the valley of Raḍwā, around whom the angels bandy words.
And there are no streams of honey and water beside him, nor is drink provided, and with it food.
And ibn Khawla has tasted of death, just as his father tasted of decease.
If any man could have lived for ever on account of his greatness, verily the chosen one [Muḥammad] would have lived for ever."

The poet known by the name of Saiyid al-Ḥimyarī was also of the school of the Kaisanīyah who looked for the coming of Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah, and claimed that he is imprisoned at Mt. Raḍwa until he is called to appear. And about this he says in a poem of his:[2]

"But everyone who is on the earth disappears—
This is the decree of him who created the Imām."

The first who arose to preach the doctrine of the Kaisānīyah in regard to the Imāmate of Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah was al-Mukhtār ibn-abī-'Ubaid al-Thaḳafī. The 31
reason for this was that 'Ubaidallāh ibn-Ziyād[4] when he had killed Muslim ibn-'Aḳīl, and al-Ḥusain ibn-'Alī, was

---

[1] Not in Mas'ūdi.

[2] For Messianic ideals in Islam *cf.* Van Vloten, *Chiitisme*, p. 54 ff.; Friedländer, "Die Messias Idee im Islam" (in Festschrift zum 70ten Geburtstage A. Berliner's, Frankfurt A. M. 1903, pp. 116-130, especially pp. 121 ff. and p. 127.)

[3] Ṭabarī, *Chronique*; ed. Zotenberg, vol. iv, p. 18 *et seq.*

[4] *Ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 34.

told that al-Mukhtār ibn-abi-‘Ubaid was one of those who had rebelled with Muslim ibn-‘Aḳīl. He had then disappeared, and when, having been ordered to return, he came to ibn-Ziyād, the latter threw a club which was in his hand and cut his eye. He then imprisoned him. Some of the people, however, plead with him in favor of al-Mukhtār, so that he brought him out of prison and said to him: " I give thee three days, and lo during that time thou shalt go away from al-Kūfah, else I will behead thee." Al-Mukhtār then fled from al-Kūfah to Mecca, where he swore allegiance to ‘Abdallāh ibn-al-Zubair,[1] remaining with him until ibn-al-Zubair fought the army of Yazīd ibn-Mu‘āwiyah, which was under the command of al-Ḥusain ibn-Numair al-Sukūtī. Al-Mukhtār distinguished himself in these wars against the people of Syria. Then Yazīd ibn-Mu‘āwiyah died, and the Syrian army returned to Syria while the command of al-Ḥijāz, al-Yaman, al-‘Irāḳ and Persia remained with ibn-al-Zubair. Al-Mukhtār having suffered evil treatment from ibn-al-Zubair, fled to al-Kūfah. The governor of this city was at that time ‘Abdallāh ibn-Yazīd al-Anṣārī,[2] under ‘Abdallāh ibn-al-Zubair. When he [al-Mukhtār] entered al-Kūfah he sent his messengers to the sectaries of al-Kūfah and its districts up to al-Madā’in demanding their allegiance to him and promising them that he was coming to claim their revenge for al-Ḥusain ibn-‘Alī. He invited them to recognize Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah, claiming that al-Ḥanafīyah had chosen him as caliph, and that it was he [al-Ḥanafīyah] who had commanded them to obey him
32 [al-Mukhtār]. It was at this time that ibn-al-Zubair removed ‘Abdallāh ibn-Yazīd al-Anṣārī from the governorship of al-Kūfah and put in his place ‘Abdallāh ibn-Muṭī‘ al-‘Adawī. The number of those who recognized al-Mukh-

---

[1] *Ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 610 *et seq.*

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. iv, pp. 58, 66, 69, 81.

tār[1] and gathered around him amounted to seventeen thousand. Among them was ‘Ubaidallāh ibn-al-Ḥirr, who entered into allegiance with him. There was no braver than al-Ḥirr in his day. Ibrāhīm ibn-Malik al-Ashtar also joined[2] al-Mukhtār. Among the secretaries of al-Kūfah there was not a finer one than he, nor one who had more followers. Al-Mukhtār set out with these men against the governor of al-Kūfah, ‘Abdallāh ibn-Muṭī‘, who on that day was at the head of twenty thousand.[3] The strife between them lasted for several days. At the end of this time the Zaidīyah were defeated and fled, and al-Mukhtār made himself governor over al-Kūfah and its surroundings. He also killed all those in al-Kūfah who had fought against al-Ḥusain ibn-‘Alī at Karbilā’. Then he delivered the *khuṭbah* before the people and said: " Praise be to Allah who promised his friend victory and his enemy harm, and definitely put both of them in this condition, a final disposition of them and a decisive settlement. O men, we have heard the invitation of the preacher and we have received the view of the preacher how many tyrants, male and female, and how many murderers do we recall?"[4] Bring hither the servants of Allah to swear allegiance to the proper leader and to fight the enemy, and lo, I am the leader of those who mourn, and the investigator of the murder of the son of the daughter of the seal of the prophets." He then descended from his pulpit and sent a message by the head of his body-guard to the house of ‘Umar ibn-Sa‘d,[5] to cut off his head. He then cut off the

---

[1] Wellhausen, *Religiös-Politischen Oppositionsparteien im Alten Islam*, pp. 28 *et seq.*

[2] Ṭabarī, *Chronique* ed. Zotenberg, vol. iv, pp. 81 *et seq.*

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. iv, pp. 81 *et seq.*

[4] *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 632.

[5] *Ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 75 *et seq.*

head of his son Ja'far ibn-'Umar who was the son of the sister of al-Mukhtār, and he said: "That is for the head of al-Ḥusain; and this is for the head of the son of al-Ḥusain
33 the great." After this he sent Ibrāhīm ibn-Mālik al-Ashtar with six thousand men for the battle against 'Ubaidallāh ibn-Ziyād, who was at that time in al-Mauṣil with eighty thousand of the Syrian army, over whom 'Abd-al-Malik ibn-Marwān[1] had placed him as governor. When the two armies met at the gate of al-Mauṣil, the Syrian army was put to flight and seventy thousand of them were killed on the field of battle, including 'Ubaidallāh ibn-Ziyād and al-Ḥusain ibn-Numair al-Sukūtī. Ibrāhīm ibn-al-Ashtar sent their heads to al-Mukhtār, who, when he had succeeded in becoming governor of al-Kūfah, al-Jazīrah and of al-Māhīn [Persia] as far as the border of Armenia, claimed that he was a *kāhin*, who wrote rhymed prose like the rhymed prose of the *kāhins*. It is also said that he claimed an inspiration had come to him; and a specimen of his rhymed prose is as follows: "By him who has sent down the Koran; and revealed the Book; and given the laws for religion; and who disapproves of disobedience; I will kill al-Nu'āt[2] of al-Azd and 'Umān, and of Madhḥij and Hamadhān, and of Nahd and Khaulān, and of Bakr and of Hazzān, and of Thu'al and of Nabhān, and of 'Abs and of Dhubyān, and of Ḳais and of 'Ailān." Then he said: "By the All-hearing one, the Knowing, the Mighty, the Lofty, the Powerful, the Wise, the Merciful, the Compassionate, verily I will crush completely the leaders of the Bani Tahīm [Tamīm?]."

Then the news of al-Mukhtār reached ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah and he was afraid of a religious strife, and desired to go against al-'Irāḳ so that those who believed in his Imāmate should gather around him. Al-Mukhtār, hearing this, was

---

[1] *Ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 75 *et seq.*

[2] I. Goldziher, *Abhandlungen zur Arabischen Philologie*, p. 65.

afraid of his arrival in al-'Irāḳ, for fear he would rob him of his leaders and governors. So he said to his army: "I swear allegiance to the Mahdī, but the Mahdī has a sign, *e. g.*, that he shall be struck by a blow of a sword, and the sword shall not cut his skin; such a man is the Mahdī." 34
This speech of his was reported to ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah, and he remained in Mecca fearing that al-Mukhtār might kill him if he went to al-Kūfah. Then the Sabbābīyah of the Ghulāt of the Rāfiḍah tricked al-Mukhtār, and said to him: "Thou art the ultimate authority of this age."[1] And they persuaded him to claim that he was a prophet. This he did, asserting among his intimates that a revelation had come down to him, whereupon he said in rhymed prose: "By the hurrying of the clouds, and by the heavy punishment, and by the swift reckoning, and by the rich giver, and by the powerful conqueror, verily I shall open the grave of ibn-Shihāb, the betrayer, the liar, the unbelieving sinner. Again, by the Lord of the two worlds, and by the Lord of the faithful land, verily I will kill the hateful poet, the *rājiz* [*rajaz*-metre] poet of the heretics, and the friends of the heretics, and the supporters of the unrighteous, and the brothers of satans, who gathered together for worthless objects, and forged tales against me. Hail to those of praiseworthy character; and of good deeds and of ready thought, and fortunate soul." After this he preached and said in his *khuṭbah:* "Praise be unto Allah, who has made me a knowing one, and has enlightened my heart. By Allah, verily I will burn the dwelling places in this region. And verily I will open the graves there. And verily I will save some of them. And Allah is sufficient as a leader and helper." Then he swore and said: "By the Lord of the sacred enclosure, and by the sacred house, and by the hon-

---

[1] De Slane, Ibn-Khallikān, vol. i, p. 229; ii, p. 12.

ored corner of the Ka'bah, and by the esteemed mosque, and by the possessor of the pen; verily a standard will be raised for me from here to Aḍam,[1] and then to the borders of Dhi Salam." Then he said: "Verily, by the lord of heaven, fire shall be sent down from heaven; and verily it
35 will burn the house of Asmā'." These words reached Asmā' ibn-Khārijah and he said: "Abū-Isḥāḳ has attacked me in rhymed prose and now he will burn my house." So he fled from his house, and al-Mukhtār sent someone to burn his house during the night, pretending to those around him that fire from heaven was sent down to burn it. It was after this that the people of al-Ḳūfah went out against al-Mukhtār for posing as a *kāhin*.[2] The Sabbābīyah gathered around him, together with the slaves of the people of al-Kūfah, because he had promised to give them the possessions of their masters. And he fought with them against those who had gone out against him, conquering them and killing most of them; the rest he took prisoner, and among these was a man called Surāḳah ibn-Mirdās al-Bāriḳī; he was brought to al-Mukhtār, and fearing that the latter would order his death, he said to those who imprisoned him and brought him to al-Mukhtār: "Ye are not the ones who have taken us prisoners, nor are ye the ones that have defeated us with your force; on the contrary, it is the angels who have defeated us, the angels whom we saw on mottled horses above your soldiers." Al-Mukhtār admired his words, and freed him, whereupon he went to Mus'ab ibn-al-Zubair in al-Baṣrah, and from there he wrote these verses to al-Mukhtār:[3]

---

[1] Wide valley in al-Ḥijāz. *Cf.* Müller, al-Hamadānī: *Geographie der Arabischen Halbinsel,* p. 171.

[2] Abū'l-Maḥāsin, vol. i, p. 198, ed. Juynboll.

[3] Variants in *Kitāb al-Aghānī,* vol. vii, p. 32. *Cf.* Dīnawarī, *Kitāb al-Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl,* p. 309. Pub. by Vladimir Giurgass.

"Lo, tell abi-Isḥāḳ that I have seen silent the mottled black [horses]
I show my eyes what neither of them sees, and what they both believe
to be an invention.
I denounce your revelation, and take a vow to fight you until death."

In what we have here recounted is to be found the reason of al-Mukhtār's posing as a *kāhin,* and claiming a revelation for himself. As to the reason for his words claiming that Allah may have had a beginning, the following incident explains it. When Ibrāhīm ibn-al-Ashtar heard that al-Mukhtār was posing as a *kāhin* and claiming inspiration for himself, he ceased his help and governed the territory of Meso- 36 potamia for himself. When Muṣ'ab ibn-al-Zubair learned that Ibrāhīm ibn-al-Ashtar had deserted al-Mukhtār, he longed to subdue al-Mukhtār. In this, he was joined by 'Ubaidallāh ibn-al-Ḥirr al-Ju'afī and Muḥammad ibn-al-Ash'ath al-Kindī,[1] as well as most of the leaders of al-Kūfah, who were irritated against al-Mukhtār for having seized their possessions and slaves; the latter inciting Muṣ'ab to covet the seizure of al-Kūfah by force. Muṣ'ab set forth from al-Baṣrah with seven thousand men of his own, in addition to those leaders of al-Kufah who had made common cause with him. As commander over the van of his army he set al-Muhallab ibn-abū-Ṣufrah[2] with his following of the Azd. The command of the cavalry he gave to 'Ubaidallāh ibn-Ma'mar[3] al-Taimī. Over the Tamīmite cavalry he placed al-Aḥnaf ibn-Ḳais.[4] When news of them reached al-Mukhtār, he sent out his commander Aḥmad ibn-Shumaiṭ to fight Muṣ'ab with three thousand picked soldiers, telling them that the victory would be theirs. He claimed that a revelation had come to him concerning this. The two armies met at al-Madā'in, and the followers of al-Mukhtār were put to flight, and their emir, ibn-Shumaiṭ, was killed, together with most of al-Mukhtār's leaders. And the remnant returned to al-Mukhtār and said to him: "Why didst thou promise us victory over our enemies?" And he said: "Indeed, Allah has promised this to me, but he suddenly changed his mind." He went on to prove this regarding Allah with the words of the Koran: "What he pleaseth will God abrogate or confirm." [1] And this is how the Kaisānīyah came to believe that Allah may have had a beginning.

---

[1] Ṭabarī, *ibid.,* vol. v, p. 97.

[2] *Ibid.,* vol. iv, p. 97.

[3] *Ibid.,* vol. iii, pp. 513, 563.

[4] *Ibid.,* vol. iii, p. 449 *et seq.*

37 Al-Mukhtār then took upon himself the killing of Muṣ'ab ibn al-Zubair in al-Madhār [2] in the region of al-Kūfah. And in this engagement Muḥammad ibn-al-Ash'ath al-Kindī was killed. Al-Mukhtār said: "His death pleases me because he is the only one remaining of those who killed al-Ḥusain, and now I am not afraid of death." After this al-Mukhtār and his allies were put to flight, and they fled to the residence of the Imām in al-Kūfah, and fortified themselves in it with four hundred followers. And Muṣ'ab besieged them three days until their food gave out, and on the fourth day they made a sally, seeking death, and were slaughtered, and al-Mukhtār was killed with them. Two brothers called Ṭārif and Ṭarīf killed him; they were the sons of 'Abdallāh ibn-Dajājah of the Banu Ḥanīfah. A'shā Hamdān [3] says about them:

"I have prophesied, and the prophets have gained renown,
Through the evil things that happened in al-Madhār,
And I am naturally not pleased with the destruction of my people
Even if it happened, for they were in an evil strait.
But I rejoice over that which abū-Isḥāḳ suffers, through mortification
and shame."

---

[1] Surah, 13, v. 39.

[2] Yāḳūt, vol. iv, p. 468.

[3] *Kitāb al-Aghāni*, vol. v, pp. 146-161.

This is an explanation of the view of the Kaisānīyah that Allah may have a beginning. But some of the Kaisānīyah who looked for Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah differed over this latter question, claiming that he was alive, imprisoned at Mt. Raḍwā, till the time of his summoning. Over the reason of his imprisonment there, they disagreed; some saying that "Allah is secret in his affairs, no one knows them except he, and he gives no explanation for the reason of his imprisonment." While others said: "Verily Allah punished him by this imprisonment, because after the death of al-Ḥusain ibn-'Alī he went over to Yazīd ibn-Mu'āwiyah, 38 and because he demanded peace of him, and accepted largesses from him." Moreover because he fled from ibn-al-Zubair in Mecca to 'Abd al-Malik ibn-Marwān. And they claimed that his companion 'Āmir ibn-Wāthilah al-Kinānī [1] came before him, and spoke to his followers about this departure of his in the following words: "O my brothers, O my helpers, do not depart, but stand by the Mahdī, so that ye may be led. O Muḥammad, the generous one, O Muḥammad, thou art the Imām, the pure, the right leader, not ibn-al-Zubair al-Sāmirī, the heretic, nor is he the one whom we set up as a goal." But it was said that he should have fought ibn-al-Zubair, and not have fled. By refusing to fight him he disobeyed his master, and further disobeyed him by seeking out 'Abd-al-Malik ibn-Marwān. But even before this he had been disobedient by seeking out Yazīd ibn-Mu'āwiyah. It was after this that he mended his ways, and joined ibn-Marwān in al-Ṭā'if. And ibn-'Abbās died there, and was buried there by ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah. From there the latter went to al-Dhar [in Khurāsān, near Bukhara]. But as to what occurred when he reached the pass of Raḍwā, they differ. Those believing in his death, hold that he died there; while those expecting his return say that armies met at al-Madā'in, and the followers of al-Mukhtār were put to flight, and their emir, ibn-Shumaiṭ, was killed, together with most of al-Mukhtār's leaders. And the remnant returned to al-Mukhtār and said to him: "Why didst thou promise us victory over our enemies?" And he said: "Indeed, Allah has promised this to me, but he suddenly changed his mind." He went on to prove this regarding Allah with the words of the Koran: "What he pleaseth will God abrogate or confirm." [1] And this is how the Kaisānīyah came to believe that Allah may have had a beginning.

---

[1] Ṭabarī, *ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 130.

37 Al-Mukhtār then took upon himself the killing of Muṣ'ab ibn al-Zubair in al-Madhār [2] in the region of al-Kūfah. And in this engagement Muḥammad ibn-al-Ash'ath al-Kindī was killed. Al-Mukhtār said: "His death pleases me because he is the only one remaining of those who killed al-Ḥusain, and now I am not afraid of death." After this al-Mukhtār and his allies were put to flight, and they fled to the residence of the Imām in al-Kūfah, and fortified themselves in it with four hundred followers. And Muṣ'ab besieged them three days until their food gave out, and on the fourth day they made a sally, seeking death, and were slaughtered, and al-Mukhtār was killed with them. Two brothers called Ṭārif and Ṭarīf killed him; they were the sons of 'Abdallāh ibn-Dajājah of the Banu Ḥanīfah. A'shā Hamdān [3] says about them:

"I have prophesied, and the prophets have gained renown,
Through the evil things that happened in al-Madhār,
And I am naturally not pleased with the destruction of my people
Even if it happened, for they were in an evil strait.
But I rejoice over that which abū-Isḥāḳ suffers, through mortification and shame."

---

[1] Surah, 13, v. 39.

[2] Yāḳūt, vol. iv, p. 468.

[3] *Kitāb al-Aghāni*, vol. v, pp. 146-161.

This is an explanation of the view of the Kaisānīyah that Allah may have a beginning. But some of the Kaisānīyah who looked for Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah differed over this latter question, claiming that he was alive, imprisoned at Mt. Raḍwā, till the time of his summoning. Over the reason of his imprisonment there, they disagreed; some saying that "Allah is secret in his affairs, no one knows them except he, and he gives no explanation for the reason of his imprisonment." While others said: "Verily Allah punished him by this imprisonment, because after the death of al-Ḥusain ibn-'Alī he went over to Yazīd ibn-Mu'āwiyah, 38 and because he demanded peace of him, and accepted largesses from him." Moreover because he fled from ibn-al-Zubair in Mecca to 'Abd al-Malik ibn-Marwān. And they claimed that his companion 'Āmir ibn-Wāthilah al-Kinānī [1] came before him, and spoke to his followers about this departure of his in the following words: "O my brothers, O my helpers, do not depart, but stand by the Mahdī, so that ye may be led. O Muḥammad, the generous one, O Muḥammad, thou art the Imām, the pure, the right leader, not ibn-al-Zubair al-Sāmirī, the heretic, nor is he the one whom we set up as a goal." But it was said that he should have fought ibn-al-Zubair, and not have fled. By refusing to fight him he disobeyed his master, and further disobeyed him by seeking out 'Abd-al-Malik ibn-Marwān. But even before this he had been disobedient by seeking out Yazīd ibn-Mu'āwiyah. It was after this that he mended his ways, and joined ibn-Marwān in al-Ṭā'if. And ibn-'Abbās died there, and was buried there by ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah. From there the latter went to al-Dhar [in Khurāsān, near Bukhara]. But as to what occurred when he reached the pass of Raḍwā, they differ. Those believing in his death, hold that he died there; while those expecting his return say that

---

[1] Ṭabarī, *ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 130.

Allah imprisoned him there, and hid him from the eyes of men, as a punishment for the sins which they attributed to him, until he is bidden to come forth. And he is the expected Mahdī.

5. Concerning the Imāmīyah of the Rāfiḍah.

These are the Imāmīyah who divided off from the Zaidīyah, the Kaisānīyah, and the Ghulāt into fifteen sects:[1] the Kāmilīyah, the Muḥammadīyah, the Bāḳirīyah, the 39 Nāwisīyah, the Shamīṭīyah, the ʻAmārīyah, the Ismāʻīlīyah, the Mubārakīyah, the Mūsawīyah, the Ḳaṭīʻīyah, the Twelvers (Ithna ʻAsharīyah), the Hishāmīyah, the Zarārīyah, the Yūnusīyah, and the Shaiṭānīyah.

a. Concerning the Kāmilīyah from among them:

These are the followers of a man from the Rāfiḍah who was known as abū-Kāmil.[2] He claimed that the Companions were unorthodox because they forsook their allegiance to ʻAlī, and he condemned ʻAlī for ceasing to fight them, as he was bound to fight the people of Ṣiffīn. Bashshār ibn-Burd,[3] the blind poet, belonged to this school. The report is that someone said to him: "What is thy opinion regarding the Companions?" And he replied that they were unorthodox. He was then asked: "And what is thy opinion of ʻAlī?" And he quoted the words of the poet:[4]

"What is the evil of the three caliphs O Umm ʻUmar
Against thy friend who does not accompany us?"

---

[1] Ibn-Ḥazm is vague as to divisions. Shahrastānī gives the Imāmīyah alone; under the Bāḳirīyah, and Jaʻfarīyah, he gives the Nāwisīyah, Aftaḥīyah, Shamīṭīyah, Mūsawīyah, Ismaʻīlīyah and Twelvers.

[2] Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 201.

[3] Brockelmann, *Arabische Literatur*, vol i, p. 73. Von Kremer, *Kulturgeschichtliche Streifzüge*, pp. 37 *et seq.* Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, p. 162. Ibn-Ḳutaibah, *Kitāb al-Shiʻr*, ed. Cairo, p. 188.

[4] *Kitāb al-Aghānī*, vol. iii, pp. 19-72; vol. vi, pp. 47-52.

It is also reported that to this sin of condemning the Companions and ʻAlī among them, Bashshār added two other sins: one the belief that the dead would return to the world before the day of resurrection, as the partisans of the Return[1] hold among the Rāfiḍah, and the other, that Satan is right in preferring fire to earth. As a proof of this they gave the views of Bashshār in one of his poems:

"The earth is dark and fire is light,
And fire has been worshipped since it existed."

To this Ṣafwān al-Anṣārī replied in the following poem:

"Thou didst think that fire was the finest thing as to its origin,
And upon the earth it is lighted by means of stone and fire-stick,
And wonderful things were formed in its innermost parts which can not be counted in line or in number. 40
And in the very depths of the seas there are useful things.
. . . .
You blame the moons, even though you are deformed, and nearest among the creations of Allah, to the genus ape." 42

Ḥammād[2] ʻAjrad satarized Bashshār and said:

"O, thou who art viler than an ape, even when the ape is blind."

It is reported, however, that Bashshār was untroubled by the satire in this verse, and merely replied:

"Let him see me and describe me,
Only may I not see and describe him."

ʻAbd al-Ḳāhir says: "I declare these Kāmilīyah unorthodox for two reasons. First because they condemn all of the Companions without specification, and secondly because they preferred fire to earth. Some of the disgraceful heresies of Bashshār ibn-Burd we have mentioned; and we feel that Allah has done to him what he deserves, for he satirized the Mahdī, who therefore commanded him to be thrown into the Tigris, which is a disgrace to him in this world, and to his followers, a painful punishment in the next."

---

[1] *Rajʻah* = return as same person. *Tanāsukh* = return as a different being.

[2] Ibn-Ḳutaibah ed. De Goeje, p. 490.

b. Concerning the Muḥammadīyah.[1]

These expect Muḥammad ibn-'Abdallāh ibn-al-Ḥasan ibn-al-Ḥusain ibn-'Alī ibn-abī-Ṭālib; nor do they believe that he was murdered, nor that he died; they claim that he is in Mt. Ḥājir, in the district of Najd, until he shall be com-
43 manded to return. In the error of his anthropomorphistic ideas al-Mughīrah ibn-Sa'īd al-'Ijlī[2] said to his companions: "Verily the expected Mahdī is Muḥammad ibn-'Abdallāh ibn-al-Ḥasan ibn-al-Ḥusain ibn-'Alī." As the proof of this he claimed that his name was the same as that of Muḥammad the Prophet of Allah; and his father's name was 'Abdallāh like the name of the father of the Prophet of Allah. And in a *ḥadīth* dating from the time of the Prophet, he quotes these words about the Mahdī:[3] "His name will correspond to my name, and his father's name to the name of my father." And when Muḥammad ibn-'Abdallāh ibn-al-Ḥasan ibn-al-Ḥusain ibn-'Alī began his preaching in al-Madīnah, he made himself master of Mecca and al-Madīnah, while his brother[4] Ibrāhīm ibn-'Abdallāh made himself governor of al-Baṣrah and their third brother Idrīs ibn-'Abdallāh took possession of several of the districts of the Maghrib.[5] That was in the time of the caliph abū-Ja'far al-Manṣūr, who sent 'Īsa ibn-Mūsā with a large army

---

[1] J. A. O. S., vol. xxix, p. 30. Not to be confused with the Muḥammadīyah who believe in the divinity of Muḥammad the Prophet.

[2] Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, pp. 203, 218.

[3] Friedländer, J. A. O. S., vol. xxix, pp. 43 *et seq.*

[4] Ṭabarī, *ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 326.

[5] *Ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 458.

against Muḥammad ibn-'Abdallāh ibn-al-Ḥasan ibn-al-Ḥusain. They fought and killed Muḥammad in a battle at al-Madīnah. He then sent 'Īsa ibn-Mūsā to make war on Ibrāhīm ibn-'Abdallāh ibn-al-Ḥasan ibn-al-Ḥusain ibn-'Alī. They killed Ibrāhīm at the gate of Ḥimrīn, sixteen parasangs from al-Kūfah. It was in this sedition that Idrīs ibn-'Abdallāh ibn-al-Ḥasan ibn-al-Ḥusain died in al-Maghrib. They say he was poisoned there. The father of these three brothers, 'Abdallāh ibn-al-Ḥasan ibn-al-Ḥusain, died in the jail of al-Manṣūr. His tomb is in al-Ḳādisīyah and is well 44
known and frequented by pilgrims. When Muḥammad ibn-'Abdallāh ibn-al-Ḥasan ibn-al-Ḥusain was killed in al-Madīnah, the Mughīrīyah divided into two sects, one of which acknowledged his death and denounced al-Mughīrah ibn-Sa'īd al-'Ijlī. This sect said: "Indeed, he lied when he said that Muḥammad ibn-'Abdallāh ibn-al-Ḥasan ibn-al-Ḥusain was the Mahdī who should rule the earth, for he has been killed and does not rule the earth." The other sect persisted in its adherence to al-Mughīrah ibn-Sa'īd al-'Ijlī, saying: "Indeed, he is right in saying that the Mahdī is Muḥammad ibn-'Abdallāh; verily he was not killed, but has merely disappeared from the sight of men, and is on Mt. Ḥājir in the region of Najd, remaining there until he is commanded to return. He will return and rule the earth, and allegiance will be paid him in Mecca between the corner of the Ka'bah and the *Maḳām.*[1] At that time, seventeen men will be brought to life, each one of whom will be given one of the letters from the name of the most Holy, and they will put the armies to flight." These claim that the one whom the army of 'Īsa ibn-Mūsā killed in al-Madīnah was not Muḥammad ibn-'Abdallāh ibn-al-Ḥasan. This sect is called al-Muḥammadīyah, because they look for the coming

---

[1] Halting place for prayer.

of Muḥammad ibn-ʻAbdallāh ibn-al-Ḥasan. Jābir ibn-Yazīd al-Juʻafī belonged to this sect. He was wont to speak of the return of the dead to this world before the resurrection. On this subject, a poet of this sect has said in one of his poems:

> "Up to the day in which men return
> To their world before their day of reckoning."

Those who hold our views say to this sect: "If you assert
45 that he who was killed in al-Madīnah was other than Muḥammad ibn-ʻAbdallāh ibn-al-Ḥasan, and you assert that the one killed there was Satan transformed into man in the person of Muḥammad ibn-ʻAbdallāh ibn-al-Ḥasan, then believe also that those killed at Karbilā' were other than al-Ḥusain and his companions, that they were only devils having put on the form of men in the person of al-Ḥusain and his companions; then look for al-Ḥusain as ye look for Muḥammad ibn-ʻAbdallāh ibn-al-Ḥasan, or then look for ʻAlī as the Sabbābīyah among you look for him. They claim that he is among the clouds, and that the one whom ʻAbd-al-Raḥmān ibn-Muljim killed was Satan transformed into a man in the person of ʻAlī." This shows there is no difference between them and him. May Allah be praised for this.

c. Concerning the Bāḳirīyah among them.

This people transfer the Imāmate from ʻAlī ibn-abī-Ṭālib, through his children to Muḥammad ibn-ʻAlī, the one who was known as al-Bāḳir. They say: "Verily, ʻAlī designated his son al-Ḥasan for the Imāmate; al-Ḥasan designated his brother al-Ḥusain; al-Ḥusain designated his son ʻAlī ibn-al-Ḥusain Zain-al-ʻĀbidīn and Zain-al-ʻĀbidīn called to the Imāmate Muḥammad ibn-ʻAlī known as al-Bāḳir; they claim that he is the expected Mahdī, concerning whom it is related that the prophet said to Jābir ibn-ʻAbdallāh al-Anṣārī:[1] "Verily, thou wilt see him and greet him from me." Jābir was the last of the Companions to die in al-Madīnah. It happened that he was blind at the end of his life, and was wont to go around in al-Madīnah exclaiming, "O Bāḳir, O Bāḳir, when shall I meet thee?" On a certain day he passed through one of the streets of al-Madīnah . . . . [page wanting in the original ms.]. Jaʻfar designated his son Ismāʻīl to the 46
Imāmate after him; when Ismāʻīl died during the life of his father, we learned that he had designated his son merely to guide the people to choose as Imām his son Muḥammad ibn-Ismāʻīl. It is to this view that the Ismāʻīlīyah of the Bāṭinīyah inclined. We will mention them later among the sects of the Ghulāt.

d. Concerning the sect of the Mūsawīyah from among them.

These are the ones who transferred the Imāmate to Jaʻfar.[2] Then they claimed that the Imām after Jaʻfar was his son Mūsā ibn-Jaʻfar, and they claimed that Mūsā ibn-Jaʻfar[3] was alive, and not dead, and that he was the expected Mahdī. They said that he went into the house of al-Rāshid and has not come forth from it; [adding] we are sure of his Imāmate; but we have doubts of his death and we would not decide on it without proof." And it was said to this sect which was called the Mūsawīyah: "If you doubt his being alive and his death, then doubt his Imāmate, and do not assert definitely that he is in existence and that he is the expected Mahdī; all the more so since you know that the burial-place of Mūsā ibn-Jaʻfar is well known in the western part of Baghdad, and is visited." And this sect is called the Mūsawīyah because it looks for Mūsā ibn-Ja'far; and it is also called the Mamṭūrah because Yūnus ibn-'Abd-al-Raḥmān al-Ḳummī was among the al-Ḳaṭī'īyah, in a debate with a member of the sect he said the following: "You are of less account in my eyes than the Mamṭūrah dogs [dogs rained upon]."

---

[1] Ibn-Ḥajar, Biographical Dictionary, vol. i, p. 432.

[2] De Slane, Ibn-Khallikān, vol. i, p. 300.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 463.

47 e. Concerning the Mubārakīyah.

They desired the Imāmate to go to the son of Muḥammad ibn-Ismā'īl ibn-Ja'far [1] as the Bāṭinīyah claim; but the genealogists say in their books that Muḥammad ibn-Ismā'īl ibn-Ja'far died and left no offspring.

f. Concerning the branch called the al-Ḳaṭī'īyah from among them.

These transferred the Imāmate from Ja'far al-Sādiḳ to his son Mūsā, and believe in the death of Mūsā, and claim that the Imām who succeeded him was the grandson of Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥasan, who was a grandson of 'Alī ibn-Mūsā al-Riḍā. They were also called Twelvers,[2] because of their assertion that this expected Mahdī would be the twelfth in line from 'Alī ibn-abī-Ṭālib. And they differed over the age of this twelfth Imām at the death of his father. Some said that he was four years old, and some that he was eight years old. They also differed over his right to rule at that time; some claiming that even then he was really Imām, knowing all that an Imām should know, obedience to him being obligatory; while others claimed that although under age, he was theoretically Imām, for no other could be Imām, decisions meanwhile being in the hands of the learned men of the school until his coming of

---

[1] Friedländer, J. A. O. S., vol. xxviii, pp. 58-69. The Seveners believed him to be the last Imām.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. xxix, p. 171, *cf.* Ithnā'asharīyah.

age, at which time this Imāmate was definitely recognized and to whom obedience was due; and that he is now the Imām to whom obedience is due, although he is absent.[1]

g. Concerning those called the Hishāmīyah among them.[2]

Of these two sects, one owes its origin to Hishām ibn-al-Ḥakam al-Rāfiḍ[3] and the other to Hishām ibn-Sālim[4] al-Jawālīḳī. To their true doctrines in regard to the Imāmate 48 these two sects added the error of predicating a body to Allah, as well as their heresy as regards anthropomorphisms.

Concerning the views of Hishām ibn-al-Ḥakām: Hishām ibn-al-Ḥakām claimed that that which he worshipped was a body possessing dimensions, height, breadth and thickness, its height being equal to its breadth and to its depth, while its length and breadth are specified only as long and broad. He held, moreover, that its extension upward is no greater than its breadth. In addition, he claimed that the object that he worshipped was a diffusing light, shining as a pure chain of silver, and as a pearl perfectly rounded. This object also possessed, according to him, color, taste, smell, touch.[5] He also claims that its color is its taste, its taste its smell, its smell its touch. He does not say that color and taste are its essence, but he claims that the object itself is color and taste. He went on to say that Allah was, when space was not, and it was by his own motion that he created space, space thus appearing for the first time, and it is in this space that Allah is, and this space is his throne.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, vol. xxviii, p. 53.

[2] Not to be confused with the Hishāmīyah of the Mu'tazilites.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. xxvii, p. 65. Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 212. Mas'udi, *ibid.*, vol. v, pp. 443 *et seq.*, vol. vi, pp. 370 *et seq.*, vol. vii, p. 232 *et seq.*

[4] Al-Fihrist, p. 177.

[5] *Cf.* M. Horten, *Philosophischen Systeme der spekulativen Theologen im Islam*, p. 170. Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 87.

Some report of Hishām that he described the object which he worshipped as seven spans [measured] by his own span, as if he had measured him according to human measurement, since in the majority of cases man is seven spans by his own span.

Abū-al-Hudhail in one of his books says that he met Hishām ibn-al-Ḥakām in Mecca near the mount of abū-Ḳubais[1] and asked him which of the two was greater, the being he worshipped or this mountain. He answered, pointing to it: "The mountain towers above him, the exalted, i. e. verily the mountain is greater than he."[2]

49 Ibn-al-Rawandi relates in one of his books about Hishām that he said: "There is a likeness between Allah and bodies that can be felt in some way; if this were not so, they would not point to Him."

Al-Jāḥiz, in one of his books, says about Hishām: that he said that Allah knows what is under the earth only by means of the rays that come from him and penetrate to the depths of the earth. And they said, unless his rays touched what was behind the moving bodies, he would not have seen what is behind it, nor would he have known about it. Abū-'Īsā al-Warrāḳ said in his book that some of Hishām's companions answered him that Allah touches his throne, but is not separate from it; nor is the throne separate from him. It is also reported that Hishām, in addition to his error concerning the Tauḥīd [unity], erred concerning the attributes of Allah. He changed the opinion that Allah does not cease knowing things, claiming that he knows things after not having known them, through knowledge, and that knowledge is one of his attributes, not identical with him, nor is it anything other than he, nor is it a part of him. He said,

---

[1] The highest in the range around Mecca. De Goeje, *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum*, vol. vii, p. 314.

[2] Friedländer, *ibid.*, vol. xxix, p. 27.

moreover, that his knowledge cannot be said to be eternal, nor created, for it is an attribute, and according to him an attribute cannot be predicated. About the power of Allah, and his hearing, and his seeing, and his life, and his will, he said, verily they are not eternal nor created, because an attribute cannot be predicated. And he said in regard to them that they are he and no other. He also said that Allah, had he never ceased knowing things that are knowable, the latter would be eternal, because one cannot be a knower without an object already existing to be known, as if Hishām had impugned the possibility of knowing the non-existent. Hishām said, moreover, that if Allah was the knower of 50 that which his servants did for him before their deeds actually occurred, the free will of his servants would not be possible, nor could they impose duties upon themselves. In regard to the Koran, he was wont to say that it was neither creator nor created. It could, nevertheless, not be said that it was not created, because such a statement would be an attribute and, according to him, an attribute cannot be predicated. As to the deeds of Allah's servants, the traditions about them, according to him, are divergent. One tradition says they were created of Allah, another that they are ideas, and neither things nor bodies, for according to Hishām a thing can only be a body. Regarding the prophets, Hishām considered it lawful to say that they were disobedient, although the Imāms he considered sinless. In connection with this he claimed that the prophet disobeyed his Lord in taking ransom from the prisoners of Badr, but Allah forgave him. Applied to this are the words of Allah: "May Allah forgive thee that which thou hast done early by thy fault and that in which thou didst delay."[1] Thus he distinguished between prophet and Imām, since to the

---

[1] Surah 48, v. 2.

Prophet when he disobeyed there came a revelation calling attention to his sins, while to the Imām no such revelation came; he must therefore be free from disobedience. As regards the Imāmate, Hishām belonged to the school of the Imāmīyah, although the rest of the Imāmīyah condemned him because he thought the Prophet capable of disobedience. Furthermore, he denied that any of the parts of a body were limited, and it was from him that al-Naẓẓām [1] took the doctrine that what could be no further divided was non-existent. Zurḳān [2] says of him in his treatise that he held
51 that it was possible for one body to pass into another, just as al-Naẓẓām held that two thin bodies could be in the same place [at the same time]. Zurḳān reports further that he said: "Man consists of two things, a body and a soul. The body is dead, the soul, however, is sentient and intelligent, and acts on the outside world. It is a light like the bodies in the universe that give light." As regards earthquake, Hishām said: "The earth is made up of different elements each closely attached to the other. Thus when one of these elements becomes weak the other becomes stronger, and an earthquake takes place; if the element further increases in weakness, there is an eclipse." Zurḳān also reported of him that he considered it possible for someone who was not a prophet to walk on water, although he did say that miracles could not be performed by one who was not a prophet.

Concerning Hishām ibn-Sālim al-Jawālīḳī: This Jawālīḳī while belonging in his heresies to the school of the Imāmīyah went to the extreme as regards the doctrine of corporeality and anthropomorphism. He claimed that the object which he worshipped was in the image of man, but was not flesh and blood, being a diffused white light. He claimed also that he possesses five senses, like the senses of

---

[1] Friedländer, *ibid.*, vol. xxix, p. 58.

[2] According to punctuation in Dhahabī, *al Mushtabih*, p. 240.

man, and has hands and feet and eyes and ears and nose and mouth, and he hears by a different means from that by which he sees, and the rest of the senses being different in the same way. He goes on to say that the upper half of this being is hollow and the lower is solid.

Abū-'Īsā al-Warrāḳ [1] reports that he claims that his object of worship had black hair, it being a black light, but the rest of the person is white light.

Our Sheikh abū'l-Ḥasan al-'Ash'arī reports in his treatise that Hishām ibn-Sālim held the same views as Hishām
ibn-al-Ḥakam as regards the will of Allah. They maintain 52
that his will is an act, a mental image which is not Allah معنى
nor anyone besides him. Thus if Allah wishes anything, he moves, and that which he wishes is. In this abū-Mālik al-Haḍramī agrees, as well as 'Alī ibn-Maitham, who were of the sheikhs of the Rāfiḍīyah, i. e., that the will of Allah is a separate act; but they hold further that the will of Allah is outside of him.

It is also said of al-Jawālīḳī that he said that the acts of the servants of Allah are substances, for there is nothing in the world but substances. He thus granted that the servants of Allah could *create* substances. A similar view is reported of Shaiṭān al-Ṭāḳ.

h. Concerning the Zararīyah [2] from among them.

These are the followers of 'Alī Zarārah ibn-A'yan, who belonged to the sect al-Ḳaḥḍīyah, those who believed in the Imāmate of 'Abdallāh ibn-Ja'far. From this sect he went over to that of the Mūsawīyah. The heresy which is laid at his door is that Allah did not live, nor have power, nor hear, nor see, nor know, nor wish, until he created for himself life, and power, and knowledge, and will, and hearing, and seeing. It was after he had created these attributes for himself that he became living, powerful, wise, wishing, hearing, and seeing. The Baṣrah Ḳadarīyah inferred from this form of heresy the finiteness of Allah's will and of Allah's word. It was from this principle that the Karāmīyah inferred their doctrine that the word of Allah and his will and his apperceptions were finite.

---

[1] Mentioned in Fihrist, p. 338.

[2] Not included by Ibn-Ḥazm.

i. Concerning the Yūnusīyah[1] from among them.

They are the followers of Yūnus ibn-'Abd-al-Raḥmān al-Ḳummī.[2] Although of the Imāmīyah, he belonged to the
53 school of the Ḳaṭī'īyah, who firmly maintained that Mūsā ibn-Ja'far had died. And it was he who gave to those who would not commit themselves to a decision on the death of Mūsā the name of Mamṭurah dogs. Yūnus, however, exceeded the limits of anthropomorphism. He claimed that Allah is borne by the bearers of his throne, though he is stronger than they; just as the legs of the throne bear the throne, although the throne is stronger than they. As a proof of the fact that Allah is borne, he quoted: "And on that day eight will bear the throne of your lord above them."[3] Whereas the people of our doctrine maintain that this verse proves that the throne is borne, and not the lord.

j. Concerning the Shaiṭānīyah from among them.

These are the followers of Muḥammad ibn-al-Nu'mān al-Rāfiḍī, called Shaiṭān al-Ṭāḳ[4] up to his son Mūsā. This sect maintains that Mūsā died, and they look for a successor

---

[1] Not to be confused with the Yūnusīyah of the Murji'ah. Not a sect in Ibn-Ḥazm, J. A. O. S., vol. xxix, p. 50.

[2] Fihrist, p. 220.

[3] Surah 69, v. 17.

[4] Ibn-Ḥazm calls him the son of Ja'far, J. A. O. S., vol. xxix, p. 59; Shahrastānī calls the sect Nu'mānīyah (*cf.* Z. D. M. G., 61, 75, n. 2). Mentioned in Fihrist, p. 308, also as abū-Ja'far.

for him and agree with Hishām ibn-Sālim al-Jawālīḳī in the view that the deeds of the servants of Allah are substances; and that a servant of Allah can really produce a substance. They also agree with Hishām ibn-al-Ḥakam in the claim that Allah knows all things only after having determined them, and willed them, and that he does not know the things before determining them.

'Abd al-Ḳāhir says that we have mentioned the sects of the Rāfiḍah among the Zaidīyah and the Kaisānīyah and the Imāmīyah. Today the Kaisānīyah are undistinguishable, having mingled with the Zaidīyah and the Imāmīyah among the Zaidīyah. When quarrels arose among the Imāmīyah, some causing the others to err, one of the Imāmīyah poets satirized the Zaidīyah as follows:

"O ye useless Zaidīyah, your Imām is an unfortunate one, and cast off. 54
O ye vultures of the air,[1] go to Hell, ye have dived down and brought up stones against us."

A poet of the Zaidīyah answered him as follows:

"Our Imām is set up and stands upright, not like the one who has to be sought by sifting.
Any Imām who is not seen publicly, he is not worth unto us a mustard seed."

'Abd al-Ḳāhir says we have answered these two sects as regards their verses as follows:

"O, ye worthless Rāfiḍah, your claims are worthless throughout.
Your Imām—if he is hidden in darkness, try to reach the hidden one by means of a light
Or if he is covered up by your rancors, then bring forth by means of a sieve the one who is covered up.
But the true Imām, according to us, is revealed by the Sunnah or Koran verse.
And in them is a sufficiency for him who is rightly led. These two suffice us as a revelation."

---

[1] The bird is used for hurtful companions. Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., lxv, 358.

CHAPTER II

The Sects of the Kharijiyah

As we have mentioned before, the Khawārij form twenty sects,[1] and the following are their names: The First Muḥakkimah, the Azāriḳah, the Najadāt, the Ṣifrīyah,[2] the ‘Ajāridah (who are themselves divided into sects, one of which is the Khāzimīyah), the Shu‘aibīyah, the Ma‘lūmīyah, 55 the Majhūlīyah, the Aṣḥāb Ṭā‘ah (those who do pious deeds with no intention to please God), the Ṣaltīyah, the Akhnasīyah, the Shaibīyah, the Shaibānīyah, the Mu‘badīyah, the Rashīdīyah, the Makrumīyah, the Khamrīyah, the Shamrākhīyah, the Ibrāhīmīyah, the Wāḳifah, and the Ibāḍīyah.[3] The Ibāḍīyah are divided into various sects, the majority forming the two main sects of the Ḥafṣīyah and the Ḥādithīyah. As regards the Yazīdīyah[4] of the Ibāḍīyah

---

[1] According to Shahrastānī, the Khawārij are divided into six sects. *Cf.* Haarbrücker's translation, vol. i, p. 129.

[2] There seems to be some doubt about the pointing of this word. Shahrastānī does not point it at all. Haarbrücker transcribes it as Ṣifrīyah. Friedländer (J. A. O. S., vol. xxix) gives it as Ṣufrīyah, while Muḥammad Badr has in one place Ṣifrīyah and in the other Ṣufrīyah. We are inclined to think the latter correct, since it occurs oftener.

[3] Wellhausen: *Religiös-politischen Oppositionsparteien im Alten Islam,* Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften Göttingen, vol. v, p. 28.

[4] Shahrastānī includes the Yazīdīyah among the orthodox sects. *Cf.* Haarbrücker's translation, vol. i, p. 153.

and the Maimūnīyah[1] of the ‘Ajāridah, these were two sects of the unorthodox Ghulāt who are not included in the sects of the Moslem people. They will be mentioned in a later chapter in connection with the sects of the Ghulāt, please God.

As to the main beliefs on which the Khawārij unite, in spite of the divisions of their various sects, scholars disagree. Al-Ka‘bī says that in spite of their division into sects the Khawārij agreed on the following views, namely: in condemning ‘Alī and ‘Uthmān, the *two judges* (Arabic *al-ḥakamain*), and all the *Followers of the Camel,* and all who accepted the decision of the *two judges;* in declaring as apostates those who commit major sins; and in the necessity of rebelling against an oppressive Imām. Our sheikh abū-l-Ḥasan, on the other hand, said that they agree in condemning ‘Alī and ‘Uthmān, the *Followers of the Camel,* and the *two judges,* those who accepted their decision claiming the decision of one or both as right. He also claimed that they agreed over the necessity of rebelling against an oppressive ruler; but he does not hold al-Ka‘bī's view that they agreed in condemning those who commit major sins. The correct view is that given concerning them by our sheikh abū-l-Ḥasan; for al-Ka‘bī is wrong in his views that the Khawārij agreed in condemning those who committed major sins. The Najadāt especially, among the Khawārij, do not declare as heretics those of their followers who have made themselves liable to punishments (Arabic, *aṣḥāb al-ḥudūd*).[2] Some of the Khawārij hold that a man can be declared unorthodox only when committing sins in regard 56 to which there is no express threat (in the Koran); while as regards the sin for which there is either punishment or threat given in the Koran, the person committing such a sin cannot be designated only by an appellation mentioned in the Koran, such as adulterer, thief, and the like. The Najadāt, on the contrary, hold that the one of their number who commits a major sin is excluded from Allah's grace, but is not necessarily a heretic in faith. This shows al-Ka'bī's error in saying that all of the Khawārij agree in declaring the authors of major sins heretics, whether they belong to the Khārijite body or another. The only correct view in regard to the beliefs held in common by all the Khawārij is that which our sheikh abū-l-Ḥasan claims, namely: the condemning of 'Alī and 'Uthmān, the *Followers of the Camel*, the *two judges*, and all those who justified the decision of the *two judges*, or the decision of one of them, or accepted their arbitration. We will now take up all these divisions in detail, please God.

---

[1] Included among the orthodox sects by Shahrastānī.

[2] Juynboll: *Handbuch des Islāmischen Gesetzes,* p. 300.

1. *Concerning the first Muḥakkimah:* The Khawārij were either Muḥakkimah or Shurāh.[1] Scholars differ in regard to the first person who became a Shurāh. Some say it was 'Urwah ibn-Ḥudair,[2] the brother of Marādis al-Khāriji; and others that the first to secede was Yazīd ibn-'Âṣim al-Muḥādhī;[3] while others hold that a man of the Rabī'ah of the Banu Yashkur who was with 'Alī at Ṣiffīn, when he saw that the two parties had agreed upon the *two judges*, mounted his horse and attacked the followers of Mu'āwiyah, killing one of their men, following this with an attack on the followers of 'Alī, killing one of their men. He then cried at the top of his voice: "Verily have I given up allegiance to 'Alī and Mu'āwiyah, and am therefore not bound

---

[1] Mentioned in Shahrastānī, Haarbrücker, vol. i, p. 21, *i. e.* heretics. On the term, see Lane, S. V. and Z. D. M. G., lxi, p. 432.

[2] Ṭabarī, *Chronique* ed. Zotenberg, vol. iii, p. 683.

[3] Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 130, calls him Yazīd ibn 'Aṣim al-Muḥāribī.

by their decision." It was while fighting the followers of 'Alī that he was killed by some men from Hamadhān. As for the Khawārij, who then numbered twelve thousand, after the return of 'Alī from Ṣiffīn to al-Kūfah, they broke 57 up camp and went to Ḥarūra. This is why the Khawārij are called Ḥarūrīyah. Their leaders at the time were 'Abdallāh ibn-Kauwa and Shibt ibn-Rab'ī. 'Alī came against them and plead with them, and his arguments prevailed so that ibn-al-Kauwa put himself under 'Alī's protection with ten horsemen while the rest of them went to al-Nahrawān, and made two men commanders over them: 'Abdallāh ibn-Wahab al-Rāsibī,[1] and Ḥurḳūṣ ibn-Zuhair al-Bajalī al-'Uranī known as dhu-l-Thudaiah.[2] On their way through Nahrawān they discovered a man who was fleeing from them and having surrounded him, they said, "Who art thou?" He answered, "I am 'Abdallāh ibn-Ḥubāb ibn-al-'Aratt."[3] "Tell us," said they, "a tradition which thou didst hear from thy father and which he heard from the prophet of Allah." He said, "I have heard my father say that the prophet of Allah said, 'There will be a civil war during which he who sits will be better than he who stands, and he who stands than he who walks, and he who walks better than he who runs, and whoever is able to be killed, let him not be a slayer.'" Then a man of the Khawārij, called Masma' ibn-Ḳadalī, fell upon him with his sword and killed him, and his blood flowed in a streak over the water of the river to the other side. They then entered his house which was in the village, before the gate of which they had killed him, and put his child to death, as well as his slave (concubine), the mother of his child. They then encamped in Nahrawān. When news of them reached ‘Alī he started against them with forty thousand of his followers, accompanied by ‘Adī ibn-Ḥātim al-Ṭā’ī,[1] who said: 58

---

[1] Wellhausen, *ibid.*, p. 17 *et seq.* Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 130.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 130. For further account see Ṭabarī-Zotenberg, vol. iii, p. 683.

[3] Wellhausen: *Das Arabische Reich und sein Sturz*, p. 54. Brünnow: *Die Charidschiten*, p. 20.

> “When people fall back and slink away, we come with banners of truth fluttering like eagles,
> Against the worst of Schismatics, who have gathered together to make war on the God of men, the Lord of the East,
> Against the erring and the blind and the forsakers of true guidance, all of whom reject his word, and are unrighteous.
> And among us is ‘Alī, of excellent virtue, who leads us against them openly with shining swords.”

On arriving, ‘Alī sent word to them saying, “Hand over the slayer of ‘Abdallāh ibn-Ḥubbāb.” The answer came back, “Lo, all of us killed him, and verily if we had won the victory over thee, we should have killed thee.” Whereupon ‘Alī attacked them with his army, and they appeared before him *en masse*. But before fighting he said to them, “What makes you seek revenge from me?” They answered, “We seek revenge from thee, first of all, because we fought for thee in the *Battle of the Camel*, and when the *Followers of the Camel* were put to flight thou didst permit us [to keep] what we had won [in the way] of booty from their soldiers, but thou didst forbid our taking possession of their women and their children. Why didst thou permit us their goods and exclude their women and children?” ‘Alī answered: “I allowed their possessions to be seized only in exchange for what they had robbed from the treasury in al-Baṣrah before I came to them. But as to the women and the children, they were not fighting us. And therefore the regulations of Islām, made within the territory of Islām,[2]

---

[1] Ṭabarī, *ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 171 *et seq.*, 245, 326, 342, 653 *et seq.*, 658, 675.

[2] Dār al-Islām.

should be applied to them. None of them had apostatized from Islām, and it is not permitted to make slaves of those who are not unbelievers. Moreover, if I had allowed you to take the women, which one of you would have taken ‘Ā’ishah as his share?” The people being shamefully silenced by this, said to him, “Secondly, we seek revenge from thee for not using the *Commander of the Faithful* in connection with thy name, in the correspondence between thee and Mu‘āwiyah, when the latter disputed with thee in 59 regard to such power.” He answered, “I followed the example of the prophet of Allah on the day of al-Ḥudaibiyah, when Suhail ibn-‘Amr said to him, ‘Had I known that thou art the prophet of Allah, I would not have disputed with thee, but write down thy name and the name of thy father!’[1] Accordingly the Prophet wrote, ‘It is this upon which we, Muḥammad ibn-‘Abdallāh and Suhail ibn-‘Amr, have agreed.’ The prophet of Allah told me that the same would happen to me, in connection with them; so my experience with the sons is the same as that of the prophet of Allah with the fathers.” They then went on to say to ‘Alī, “Why didst thou say to the *two judges*, ‘If I am worthy of the caliphate, then confirm me in it?’ for if thou showest doubt concerning thy caliphate, then others (than thou) will have even more right to be in doubt concerning thee.” To this ‘Alī replied: “On that occasion I desired only justice to Mu‘āwiyah, for if I had said to the *two judges*, ‘Choose me for caliph,’ Mu‘āwiyah would not have been satisfied. Verily the prophet of Allah challenged the Christians of Najrān to invoke the curse of God on the lying faction, saying, “Come, let us summon our sons and your sons, our wives and your wives, and ourselves and yourselves. Then we will invoke and lay the malison of Allah on those who lie.' (Surah 3, v. 54.) In doing this he showed justice to them even at his own expense, for if he had said, 'I curse and ask the curse of Allah upon you,' the Christians would not have been satisfied. It is for this reason that I, in turn, was just with Mu'āwiyah. Nor do I understand the treachery of 'Amr ibn-al-'Aṣi." They then said, "Why didst thou entrust the arbitration to the *two judges* when the right was on thy side?" And he said, "I found that the Prophet of Allah had once entrusted to Sa'd ibn-Mu'ādh the arbitration of the case of the banu-Ḳuraiẓah,[1] although had he wished he need not have done it. In like manner I chose a judge, but the judge of the 60 Prophet judged justly, whereas my judge was cheated—which led to evil results. Have you any complaints beside this?" The people were silent. Most of them said, "By Allah, he speaketh the truth." And they said, "We repent." So on that day eight thousand put themselves under his control while four thousand withdrew to take part in the fight against him headed by 'Abdallāh ibn-Wahb al-Rāsibī and Ḥurḳūṣ ibn-Zuhair al-Bajalī. Then 'Alī said to those who had put themselves under his control, "Withdraw from me for this one day." And he fought the Khawārij with those who had come with him from al-Kūfah. He commanded his followers to fight them, saying, "By him in whose hand is my soul not ten of us will be killed, and not ten of them will escape." As a matter of fact, nine of the followers of 'Alī were killed on that day. These were Duwaibiyah ibn-Wabrah al-Bajalī, Sa'd ibn-Mujālid al-Saiba'ī, 'Abdallāh ibn-Ḥammād al-Juhairī, Ruḳānah ibn-Wā'il al-Arjī, al-Faiyāḍ ibn-Khalīl al-Azdī, Kaisūm ibn-Salamah al-Juhanī, 'Utbah ibn-'Ubaid al-Khaulānī, Jamī' ibn-Jusham al-Kindī, and Ḥabīb ibn-

---

[1] Ṭabarī, *ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 89.

---

[1] Ibn-Hishām, p. 674. Ṭabarī, *ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 70.

'Āṣim al-'Audī. These nine were killed under the flag of 'Alī—and no more. In the course of the conflict, Ḥurḳūṣ ibn-Zuhair presented himself before 'Alī and said, "O son of abū-Ṭālib, by Allah, we do not wish to fight with thee except for the sake of Allah and the other world." And 'Alī said to him, "Verily to you applies the word of Allah, 'Shall we tell you who they are that have lost their labor most; whose aim in the present life hath been mistaken, and who deem that what they do is right?' (Surah 18, v. 103-104.) By the Lord of the Ka'bah, you are among those referred to in the text." 'Alī then attacked them with his followers, and 'Abdallāh ibn-Wahb was killed in a duel, and Dhu-l-Thudyah 61 was thrown from his horse. Most of the Khawārij were killed that day, only nine of them escaping. Two of these went to Sijistān where the present Khawārij are their followers. And two went to al-Yaman. The Ibāḍīyah of al-Yaman are their followers. Two went to 'Umān and founded the sect of Khawārij there. Two went to the region of al-Jazīrah (Mesopotamia), and the Khawārij of al-Jazīrah are their followers. And one went to Tell Mauzan.[1] On that day 'Alī said to his followers, "Seek Dhu-l-Thudyah." They found him under a vine-tree, and they saw under his arm, near the armpit, something like the breast of a woman. Whereupon 'Alī said, "The word of Allah and his Prophet have come true;" and in accordance with 'Alī's desire he was put to death. This is the story of the First Muḥakkimah. Then the First Muḥakkimah declared as unorthodox 'Alī and 'Uthmān, the *Followers of the Camel*, Mu'āwīyah and his followers, the *two judges*, and whoever agrees with their decision; as well as all sinful and disobedient men.

Shortly after this, there rebelled against 'Alī certain

---

[1] De Goeje, *La fin de l'empire des Carmathes du Bahrein*, Journ. As. 1895, ser. ix, vol. v, pp. 11, 171.

Khawārij who were of the same view as the First Muḥakkimah. Among them was 'Ashras ibn-'Auf, who arose against him in al-Anbār, Ghalafah al-Taimī, of Taim 'Adī, arose against him in Māsīdhān;[1] al-Ashhab ibn-Bishr al-'Uranī, in Ḥarjarāya;[2] Sa'd ibn-Ḳufl in al-Mada'in,[3] and abū-Maryam al-Sa'dī in Sawād al-Kūfah. 'Alī sent an army with a leader against each one of these Khawārij until all were killed. It was in that same year, in the month of Ramaḍān, in the thirty-eighth year of the Hijra, that 'Alī was killed.

When the rule passed over to Mu'āwiyah, there rebelled
62 against him and his followers down to the time of the Azāriḳah, all who held the same views as the First Muḥakkimah. Among these was 'Abdallāh ibn-Jausha al-Ṭā'ī, who arose against Mu'āwiyah in al-Nukhailah, in Sawād al-Kūfah. Mu'āwiyah sent men from al-Kūfah against him, and killed these Khawārij. Next there arose against him [Mu'āwiyah] Ḥautharah ibn-Wadā' al-'Asadī. He was among those who sought the protection of 'Alī at the battle of al-Nahrawān, in the forty-first year. Then Farwah ibn-Naufal al-Ashja'ī,[4] and al-Mustaurid ibn-'Alḳamah al-Tamīmī rose against al-Mughīrah ibn-Shu'bah,[5] who was then the governor of al-Kūfah under Mu'āwiyah. Both of these were killed in fighting him. Mu'ādh ibn-Jarīr next rose against al-Mughīrah and was killed in the battle. Then Ziyād ibn-Kharrāsh al-'Ijlī arose against Ziyād ibn-Abīhi,

---

[1] De Goeje gives Masabadhān, *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum*, vol. vi, p. 20; vol. vii, p. 25. See also Yāḳūt, vol. iii, p. 393. As the former is a well-known place, we conclude that in the text it should be Masabadhān.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. vi, p. 7; one of the provinces of the territory watered by the Euphrates and Dujail, west of the Tigris.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. vi, p. 5.

[4] Ṭabarī, *ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 690; vol. iv, p. 6.

[5] *Ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 6.

and was killed during the fight. Ḳuraib ibn-Murrah with Zaḥāf ibn-Raḥar al-Ṭā'ī arose against 'Ubaid-Allāh ibn-Ziyād. These two put to the sword everyone they met on their way, without distinction. Ibn-Ziyād sent 'Ubād ibn-al-Ḥuṣain al-Ḥaiṭī against them with an army which defeated them. These are the Khawārij who stood by the First Muḥakkimah before the time of the strife of the Azāriḳah, and Allah knows best.

2. *Concerning the Azāriḳah.*[1] These are the followers of Nāfi' ibn-al-Azraḳ al-Ḥanafī, surnamed abū-Rāshid.[2] The Khawārij never had a sect which surpassed this in number, nor one that exceeded it in power. In creed they agreed on many points, among which were the following: the assertion that the opponents of this sect, within the Moslem community, were polytheists. The First Muḥakkimah had said that such opponents were unbelievers, but 63
not polytheists. Secondly, this sect asserted that those followers who abstained from fighting with them, although agreeing in other respects, were polytheists. The First Muḥakkimah did not condemn such abstainers, if they agreed with them in other respects. The third point on which this sect agreed was that when a soldier appears, claiming that he is one of the sect, the truth of his claim should be proved by bringing to him a captive from the opposing side whom he be commanded to kill. If he kills this captive, his claim that he is one of the sect is confirmed; if he refuses to kill the captive, he should be considered a hypocrite and a heretic, and should be put to death. Fourthly, this sect permits the killing of their opponents' wives, as well as the killing of their children.

---

[1] Dīnawarī, *al-Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl*, p. 278. Ṭabarī—De Goeje, vol. ii, p. 581.

[2] Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 133 *et seq.* Ṭabarī—Zotenberg, vol. iv, p. 76.

Moreover, they claim that the children of those who oppose them are polytheists and will therefore be in hell-fire forever. What they differ about is the question as to who was the first to put forward the doctrine which is peculiar to the Azāriḳah, namely, the declaring the Abstainers from war, as unorthodox. They also disagree as regards the originator of the trial of a soldier claiming to be of their army. Some of them claim that the first to originate these views was 'Abd-Rabbihi al-Kabīr [the elder],[1] while others say it was 'Abd-Rabbihi al-Ṣaghīr [the younger], and still others that the first was one of their men called 'Abdallāh ibn-al-Waḍīn. Nāfi' ibn-al-Azraḳ differed from ibn-al-Waḍīn and asked him to change his heretical view, but when ibn-al-Waḍīn died, Nāfi' and his followers adopted his view, saying, "He was in the right." Nāfi' did not consider that he had been unorthodox when he differed from ibn-al-Waḍīn, but he declared that person unorthodox who disagreed after he himself had seen the light. Nor did he separate himself from the First Muḥakkimah in their refusing to condemn the Abstainers as unorthodox. He said, "In regard to this point, we are inferior to them [the Muḥakkimah]." He therefore condemned as unorthodox those who, after this, opposed him in the matter of condemning the Abstainers as unorthodox.

Nāfi' and his followers claimed that the home of their opponents, within the Moslem community, was the home
64 of unbelief; and that it is permissible in this home to kill children and women. The Azāriḳah, however, rejected the stoning of the adulterer, while considering it permissible to deny a trust, the paying of which had been commanded by Allah; the explanation they gave being, "If our opponents are polytheists, then we do not need to give back a deposit

---

[1] Author of *al-'Iḳd al-Farīd.*

made by them." Nor do they apply the legal punishment to him who brings a false charge of adultery against a pious man, although they do in the case of a man who accuses pious women. They also cut off the hand of a thief, whether the amount stolen be big or little, thus ignoring the law in regard to the minimum amount of the stolen goods.[1] The community has condemned them for this innovation, which they introduced in connection with an unbelief in which the First Muḥakkimah shared. In this way one heresy led to another, just as anger incites anger. Unbelievers are doomed to great torture.

After the Azāriḳah had agreed on the innovations which we have mentioned they paid allegiance to Nāfi' ibn-al-Azraḳ, who was called the *Commander of the Faithful.* They were joined by the Khawārij of 'Umān and al-Yamān, their number amounting to more than twenty thousand. They took possession of al-Ahwāz[2] and what is beyond it of the land of Persia and Kirmān, collecting its land-tax. The governor of al-Baṣrah at that time was 'Abdallāh ibn-al-Ḥārith al-Khuzā'ī[3] under 'Abdallāh ibn-al-Zubair. 'Abdallāh ibn-al-Ḥārith despatched an army with Muslim ibn-'Abs ibn-Kuraiz ibn-Ḥabīb ibn-'Abd-Shams to fight the Azāriḳah. The two parties met in Dūlāb al-Ahwāz. In this battle Muslim ibn-'Abs was killed, together with most of his followers. After this there came against them from al-Baṣrah 'Uthmān ibn-'Ubaidallāh ibn-Ma'mar al-Tamīmī with two thousand horsemen, whom the Azāriḳah put to flight. Then there came against them Ḥārithah ibn-Badr al-Fadānī at the head of three thousand from the army of

---

[1] According to law, the seizing of anything under this minimum amount is not considered a theft; therefore it is not punishable.

[2] Meynard, *Dictionnaire de la Perse*, p. 57. Northwestern province of Persia.

[3] For an account of this governor and the successive battles, *cf.* Ṭabarī, *ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 76 *et seq.* Brünnow, *ibid.*, p. 42 *et seq.*, 52 *et seq.*

65 al-Baṣrah, but the Azāriḳah put them also to flight. ‘Abdallāh ibn-al-Zubair then wrote from Mecca to al-Muhallab ibn-abi-Ṣufrah, who was at that time in Khurāsān, commanding him to fight the Azāriḳah, and making him commander of this affair. So al-Muhallab returned to al-Baṣrah and chose from its army ten thousand men, and his people of the tribe of al-Azd joined him, making a total of twenty thousand men. This army proceeded to fight the Azāriḳah and drove them from Dūlab al-Ahwāz to al-Ahwāz. It was in this flight that Nāfi‘ ibn-al-Azraḳ died.

After his death the Azāriḳah paid allegiance to ‘Ubaidallāh ibn-Ma’mūn al-Tamīmī. Al-Muhallab then fought them in al-Ahwāz, on which occasion ‘Ubaidallāh ibn-Ma’mūn was killed, as well as his brother ‘Uthmān ibn-Ma’mūn, together with three hundred of the strongest of the Azāriḳah. Those who remained were driven to ’Īdhaj,[1] where they paid allegiance to Ḳaṭarī ibn-al-Fujā’ah, to whom they gave the title of the *Commander of the Faithful*. After this, al-Muhallab fought them in battles in which each party won alternate victories, at the end of which the Azāriḳah were driven to Sābūr,[2] in the land of Persia, which they made the land of their flight. Al-Muhallab, his sons and his followers, kept up the fight for nineteen years. Part of this period was in the days of ‘Abdallāh ibn-al-Zubair, and the rest in the time of the caliph ‘Abd-al-Malik ibn-Marwān, during the governorship of al-Ḥajjāj over al-‘Irāḳ.[3] The latter confirmed al-Muhallab in his position as leader of the army against the Azāriḳah. This war between

---

[1] ’Īdhaj is a town in al-Ahwāz. See De Goeje, *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum*, index, s. v.; Yāḳūt, *Geographisches Wörterbuch*, vol. i, p. 416 s. v.

[2] Meynard, *ibid.*, p. 293. One of the principal districts of Fars, not far from Shirāz.

[3] Ṭabarī, *ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 117 *et seq.*

al-Muhallab and the Azāriḳah kept on raging for years in different forms between Persia and al-Ahwāz, until a difference arose among the Azāriḳah which resulted in ‘Abd-Rabbihi the elder forsaking the Ḳaṭarī and going to a valley in Jīraft Kirmīn [1] with seven thousand men. ‘Abd-Rabbihi 66 the younger left him and with four thousand men went to another district of Kirmān, Ḳaṭarī remaining with about ten thousand men in the land of Persia. There al-Muhallab fought with him, and drove him to the land of Kirmān, where he pursued and fought him, driving him from there to al-Rai.[2] He then attacked and killed ‘Abd-Rabbihi the elder, while he sent his son Yazīd ibn-al-Muhallab with his followers against ‘Abd-Rabbihi the younger. At the same time al-Ḥajjāj sent Sufyān ibn-al-Abrad al-Kalbī with a great army against Ḳaṭarī after he had departed from al-Rai to Ṭabaristān, where they killed him and sent his head to al-Ḥajjāj. ‘Ubaidah ibn-Hilāl al-Yashkurī had forsaken Ḳaṭarī and gone to Ḳūmis. So Sufyān ibn-al-Abrad followed and besieged him in the fortress of Ḳūmis until he succeeded in killing him and his followers. Allah thus cleared the earth of the Azāriḳah—praise Allah for that!

3. *Concerning the Najadāt.* These were the followers of Najdah ibn-‘Āmir al-Ḥanafī.[3] The cause of his leadership and authority was that when Nāfi‘ ibn-al-Azraḳ declared unorthodox those who abstained from fighting, though they agreed with him in belief, he called them polytheists, and sanctioned the killing of the children of his opponents and their women. Abū-Ḳudail,[4] ‘Aṭīyah al-

---

[1] Meynard, *ibid.*, p. 185, town in Kirmān.

[2] De Goeje, *ibid.*, vol. vi, pp. 20 and 22, town in Persia.

[3] For Najdah and the other leaders of this sect see Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 136. Brünnow, *ibid.*, p. 46 *et seq.* Ṭabarī, *ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 102.

[4] Probably a mistake for abū-Fudaik, he being the other great schismatic in this sect. Shahrastānī, vol. i, p. 136.

Ḥanafī, Rāshid al-Ṭawīl, Miḳlāṣ and ’Aiyūb al-Azraḳ forsook Nāfi‘ with all their followers, departing for al-Yamāmah, where Najdah received them with an army of those Khawārij who desired to follow the army of Nāfi‘. They told them of Nāfi‘'s latest theories and sent them back to 67 al-Yamāmah, where they swore allegiance to Najdah ibn-‘Āmir. These men condemned as unbelievers those who had in turn condemned the Abstainers as unbelievers. They also condemned whoever admitted the Imāmate of Nāfi‘, making Najdah the Imām. About him, however, they soon differed, complaining of various things. These disagreements led to their division into three sects. One of these sects went with ‘Aṭīyah ibn-al-Aswad al-Ḥanafī to Sijistān,[1] where the Khawārij of Sijistān joined them; and it is because of this that the Khawārij of Sijistān are called ‘Aṭawīyah. The second sect joined abū-Ḳudail [Fudaik] in battle against Najdah. They are the ones who killed Najdah. The third sect broke with Najdah in regard to his theories but accepted his Imāmate. Among the deeds of Najdah for which his followers blamed him was the fact that he sent an army to attack by mainland and one to attack by sea, and to the one which he sent by land he assigned higher stipends than to the one which he sent by sea. They complained, moreover, that he had sent an army to attack the city of the Prophet of Allah and had seized there a daughter of ‘Uthmān ibn-‘Affān. ‘Abd-al-Malik having written to him about her, he had bought her back from the one in whose possession she was, and had given her back to ‘Abd-al-Malik ibn-Marwān. They therefore said to him, “Verily thou hast returned to our enemies a maiden who belongs to us.” They further complained because he pardoned those who committed faults in misdirected zeal, excusing them on the ground of ignorance. The explanation of this was that his son al-Muṭṭariḥ was sent with an army to al-Ḳaṭīf,[1] which they attacked, taking the women and children prisoners. They then took possession of the women for themselves, and married them before the fifth of the booty had been taken out for the state. Concerning this they said: “The women fell to our share, which is our desire. If their price surpasses our share of the booty, we 68 will make up for it from our own property.” When they returned to Najdah, they asked him about what they had done in seizing the women, and in eating food from the booty before the fifth had been taken out, and before the four-fifths had been divided among the soldiers. Najdah said to them, “You should not have done this.” They answered, “We did not know that this was not permitted us.” Whereupon he forgave them because of their ignorance. Then he said, “There are two things in religion. One is the recognition of Allah, and the recognition of his prophets, the interdiction of the shedding of the blood of a Moslem, the interdiction of robbing the wealth of a Moslem, and the recognition of all that comes from Allah. This recognition is incumbent on everyone who has attained the age of puberty. And the second includes all other requirements of religion. Man is forgiven for ignorance in regard to the latter, until there dawns upon him the distinction between that which is permissible and that which is forbidden. Now, whoever in his (misdirected) zeal considers a thing which is forbidden permissible, he shall be forgiven. And he who, before the evidence is established, assumes punishment for the zealot who commits a fault, is an unbeliever.” Another innovation of Najdah was that he took under his protection those of his followers who held to the punishments fixed by law, and he said, “Perhaps Allah will

---

[1] De Goeje: *ibid.*, vol. vi, p. 35.

[1] De Goeje, *ibid.*, vol. vi, p. 152, town in Baḥrain.

Ḥanafī, Rāshid al-Ṭawīl, Miḳlāṣ and ’Aiyūb al-Azraḳ forsook Nāfi‘ with all their followers, departing for al-Yamāmah, where Najdah received them with an army of those Khawārij who desired to follow the army of Nāfi‘. They told them of Nāfi‘’s latest theories and sent them back to 67 al-Yamāmah, where they swore allegiance to Najdah ibn-‘Āmir. These men condemned as unbelievers those who had in turn condemned the Abstainers as unbelievers. They also condemned whoever admitted the Imāmate of Nāfi‘, making Najdah the Imām. About him, however, they soon differed, complaining of various things. These disagreements led to their division into three sects. One of these sects went with ‘Aṭīyah ibn-al-Aswad al-Ḥanafī to Sijistān,[1] where the Khawārij of Sijistān joined them; and it is because of this that the Khawārij of Sijistān are called ‘Aṭawīyah. The second sect joined abū-Ḳudail [Fudaik] in battle against Najdah. They are the ones who killed Najdah. The third sect broke with Najdah in regard to his theories but accepted his Imāmate. Among the deeds of Najdah for which his followers blamed him was the fact that he sent an army to attack by mainland and one to attack by sea, and to the one which he sent by land he assigned higher stipends than to the one which he sent by sea. They complained, moreover, that he had sent an army to attack the city of the Prophet of Allah and had seized there a daughter of ‘Uthmān ibn-‘Affān. ‘Abd-al-Malik having written to him about her, he had bought her back from the one in whose possession she was, and had given her back to ‘Abd-al-Malik ibn-Marwān. They therefore said to him, “Verily thou hast returned to our enemies a maiden who belongs to us.” They further complained because he pardoned those who committed faults in misdirected zeal, ex-

---

[1] De Goeje: *ibid.*, vol. vi, p. 35.

cusing them on the ground of ignorance. The explanation of this was that his son al-Muṭṭariḥ was sent with an army to al-Ḳaṭīf,[1] which they attacked, taking the women and children prisoners. They then took possession of the women for themselves, and married them before the fifth of the booty had been taken out for the state. Concerning this they said: “The women fell to our share, which is our desire. If their price surpasses our share of the booty, we 68 will make up for it from our own property.” When they returned to Najdah, they asked him about what they had done in seizing the women, and in eating food from the booty before the fifth had been taken out, and before the four-fifths had been divided among the soldiers. Najdah said to them, “You should not have done this.” They answered, “We did not know that this was not permitted us.” Whereupon he forgave them because of their ignorance. Then he said, “There are two things in religion. One is the recognition of Allah, and the recognition of his prophets, the interdiction of the shedding of the blood of a Moslem, the interdiction of robbing the wealth of a Moslem, and the recognition of all that comes from Allah. This recognition is incumbent on everyone who has attained the age of puberty. And the second includes all other requirements of religion. Man is forgiven for ignorance in regard to the latter, until there dawns upon him the distinction between that which is permissible and that which is forbidden. Now, whoever in his (misdirected) zeal considers a thing which is forbidden permissible, he shall be forgiven. And he who, before the evidence is established, assumes punishment for the zealot who commits a fault, is an unbeliever.” Another innovation of Najdah was that he took under his protection those of his followers who held to the punishments fixed by law, and he said, “Perhaps Allah will punish them for their sins in some place other than hell-fire, and then have them enter paradise." Moreover, he claimed that anyone disagreeing with his religious views would enter hell-fire.

---

[1] De Goeje, *ibid.*, vol. vi, p. 152, town in Baḥrain.

Another of his errors was that he annulled the punishment [*ḥadd*] for drinking wine. He also said, "Whoever commits a minor sin or tells a small lie, and persists in it, he is a polytheist; while he who commits adultery and steals, and takes a drink without making a habit of it, he is a Moslem," provided such a man agreed with him [*Najdah*] in the principles of his faith. When he had originated these innovations, and had forgiven his followers because they had acted in ignorance, most of his followers asked him to renounce his innovations, saying, "Go into the mosque and
69 repent of your innovations." This he did, and it resulted in having some regret his repentance, and join those who had sided with him and said to him, "Thou art the Imām, and to thee belongs the right to explain the law, and it would not be seemly for us to ask thee to renounce anything. Therefore repent for having repented and let them recant who made thee recant; if not we will desert thee." And he did so. His followers, therefore, were divided concerning him, the majority deposing him and saying, "Choose us an Imām." So he chose abū-Fudaik; Rāshid al-Ṭawīl was hand in glove with abū-Fudaik. And when abū-Fudaik became governor of al-Yamāmah, he learned that the followers of Najdah, on returning from fighting the infidels, would reinstate Najdah as head. Najdah's slave, however, sought to kill him, so he hid himself in the dwelling of one of his followers, looking for the return of his soldiers whom he had sent to the seacoast of Syria and the districts of al-Yaman. Meanwhile a proclamation was given by abū-Fudaik: "Whoever shows us the way to Najdah, he shall be rewarded with ten thousand dirhems. And the slave

who brings us to him, he shall be free." Thereupon a maid of those with whom Najdah was hiding pointed out the way to him, and abū-Fudaik sent Rāshid al-Ṭawīl to him with an army. They surprised him, and brought his head to abū-Fudaik. After Najdah was killed, the Najadāt were divided into three sects. One sect condemned him and went over to abū-Fudaik. This sect included Rāshid al-Ṭawīl, abū-Baihas, and abū-l-Shamrākh, and their followers. Another sect pardoned him for what he had done, these being the present Najadāt; while the third sect departed from al-Yamāmah, and settled near al-Baṣrah, where 70
they doubted the story of the innovations of Najdah, and were undecided concerning him, saying, "We do not know whether he made these innovations or not, and we will not desert him without sure knowledge." Abū-Fudaik lived after the death of Najdah until ʻAbd-al-Malik ibn-Marwān sent Yaʻmur ibn-ʻUbaidallāh ibn-Maʻmar al-Taimī against him with an army. They killed abū-Fudaik and sent his head to ʻAbd-al-Malik ibn-Marwān. This ends the story of the Najadāt.

4. *Concerning the Ṣufrīyah.* These are the followers of Ziyād ibn-al-Aṣfar.[1] Their views are in the main like those of the Azāriḳah, namely, that those who commit sins are polytheists; except that the Ṣufrīyah do not sanction the killing of the women and the children of those who differ in belief from them, while the Azāriḳah do sanction it. One division of the Ṣufrīyah claims that when a deed for which there is definite punishment is committed, the author of that deed should be called only by the name connected with the nature of the deed, *e. g.* adulterer, thief, calumniator or intentional murderer. He is not an unbeliever or a polytheist. In all sins, however, for which there is no definite

---

[1] Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 154.

punishment, such as the omitting of the prayer or of the fast, such deeds being heretical, their authors are unbelievers . . . . . .

(Manuscript is not clear at this point.)

The third sect of the Ṣufrīyah asserted the same thing as the Baihasīyah, *i. e.* that the sinner should not be judged as an unbeliever until he has been brought before the governor and punished.

Thus the Ṣufrīyah were divided into three sects. One sect which claimed, as did the Azāriḳah, that the authors of any sin were all polytheists. The second claimed that the title of unbeliever should be given to the author of deeds which deserved no definite punishment, punishable sins being a
71 departing from belief, but not an entrance into unbelief. The third claimed that the title of unbeliever should be given to the authors of all sins which were punished by the governor. These three sects of the Ṣufrīyah differ from the Azāriḳah as regards children and women, as has been explained above.

All the Ṣufrīyah consider themselves to be under the patronage of 'Abdallāh ibn-Wahb al-Rāsibī, and Ḥurḳūṣ ibn-Zuhair and their followers from among the First Muḥakkimah. They claim, moreover, that after the death of the men already mentioned, they are under the Imāmate of abū-Bilāl Mirdās al-Khārijī, and after him of 'Imrān ibn-Ḥiṭṭān al-Sadwīsī. As to abū-Bilāl Mirdās,[1] in the days of Yazīd ibn-Mu'āwiyah, he rose in al-Baṣrah against 'Ubaidallāh ibn-Ziyād. 'Ubaidallāh ibn-Ziyād sent against him Zur'ah ibn-Muslim al-'Āmirī, with two thousand cavalry. As it happened, Zur'ah sympathized with the views of the Khawārij, and when both sides stood in battle array, Zur'ah said to abū-Bilāl, "You are on the side of truth, but we

---

[1] Ṭabarī-De Goeje, vol. ii, pp. 186, 390. Brünnow, *ibid.*, p. 35.

fear ibn-Ziyād lest he cancel our stipends, so there is nothing for us but to fight you." Abū-Bilāl answered, "I should have liked to adopt toward you the view of my brother 'Urwah who advised me to slay you indiscriminately, as Ḳuraib and Zaḥāf [1] slew indiscriminately certain men with the sword, but I disagree with both them and my brother." Thereupon abū-Bilāl and his followers attacked and defeated Zur'ah and his army. Then 'Ubaidallāh ibn-Ziyād sent against him 'Ibād ibn-Akhḍar al-Tamīmī, who fought abū-Bilāl in Tauwaj [2] and killed him, together with his followers. When the news of the death of abū-Bilāl reached ibn-Ziyād, he killed those of the Ṣufrīyah whom he found in al-Baṣrah, and having seized 'Urwah, the brother of 72
Mirdās, he said to him, "O enemy of Allah, thou didst advise thy brother Mirdās to slay men indiscriminately. Allah has avenged these men on thee and thy brother." By his orders 'Urwah's hands and feet were cut off, and he was crucified. When Mirdās was killed, the Ṣufrīyah made 'Imrān ibn-Ḥiṭṭān, Imām. He is the man who wrote elegies in verse on Mirdās, in one of which he said: [3]

> "After thee, I know not what I thought I knew before,
> After thee, O Mirdās, men are no longer men."

This Imrān ibn-Ḥiṭṭān was a hermit poet, believing strongly in the school of the Ṣufrīyah. An instance, however, of his ignominy in an attack on 'Alī is that he wrote an elegy on 'Abd-al-Raḥmān ibn-Muljim [4] who stabbed 'Alī, and said:

---

[1] Ṭabarī, *ibid.*, vol. i, pp. 90, 91.

[2] De Goeje, *ibid.*, vol. vi, p. 242, town in Persia.

[3] Noeldeke, *Delectus veterum carminum Arabicorum*, p. 90. Ṭabarī, *Annales*, vol. i, p. 3064. Shahrastānī, vol. i, p. 134. Abū-l-Maḥāsin; *Annales*, p. 24. *Kitāb al-Aghānī*, vol. xvi, p. 152 *et seq.*, this poem not quoted.

[4] Ṭabarī-Zotenberg, vol. iii, p. 706, 'Alī's murderer. *Kitāb al-Aghānī* (reads Karīm instead of Munīb. Karīm means nobleman), vol. xvi, p. 153.

"O blow from a penitent, who, in giving it, only desired to bring down favor from the possessor of the Throne,
I will mention him now, and I will consider him the richest of creatures before Allah, when it comes to the final weighing of deeds."

'Abd-al-Ḳāhir says he answered that poem with the following verse:

"O blow from an unbeliever who did not profit by it, except by the fact that it makes him burn in hell fire.
Verily I curse him for his religion and I curse also anyone who hopes for him at any time, forgiveness and pardon.
This ibn-Muljim is the worst of men, he is the lightest in the scales of the Lord of men."

5. *Concerning the 'Ajāridah of the Khawārij.* All of them are the followers of 'Abd-al-Karīm ibn-'Ajrad,[1] who 73 was a follower of 'Aṭīyah ibn-al-Aswad al-Ḥanafī. The 'Ajāridah were divided into ten sects which agreed on the view that a child is to be called to Islam when it has attained maturity, having been left in freedom before this until it is called to Islam, or speaks of it itself. Another matter in which they differed from the Azāriḳah is that the latter considered it permissible to seize the possessions of their opponents under all conditions. The 'Ajāridah, on the other hand, do not consider it lawful to seize the possessions of the opponent as booty until after killing the owner. All the 'Ajāridah agreed on this at first, but later sects divided off from them, of whom we will speak below.

6. *Concerning the Khāzimīyah.*[2] These include most of the 'Ajāridah of Sijistān. This sect agrees with the Sunnites as regards predestination, freedom of choice and will. In other words, they hold that there is no creator but Allah,

---

[1] Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 143.

[2] *Ibid.* Chārimīyah—*cf.* footnote, vol. i, p. 146.

and nothing is done unless Allah desires it. Moreover, they hold that freedom of choice comes with the deed. As a result, they condemn as unbelievers the Maimūnīyah who, in regard to predestination and freedom of choice, agree with the view of the Ḳadarīyah, who have strayed from the truth. Furthermore, the Khāzimīyah differed from the rest of the Khawārij over the question of friendship and hatred. They said, "Verily both of these are predicates of Allah." They hold that Allah loves a man for whatever faith he exhibits, even if he has been an unbeliever for most of his life. But, on the other hand, if a man becomes an unbeliever at the end of his life, Allah keeps aloof from him, even though he has been a believer all the rest of his life. They also claim that Allah does not cease loving his friends or hating his enemies; agreeing with the Sunnites concerning the perfection of man, except that these differed from the Khāzimīyah in this, holding that 'Alī, Ṭalḥah, al-Zubair and 'Uthmān were in Paradise, because they were of those who took the *Oath of Allegiance*, about 74 whom Allah said, "Allah has had mercy upon the faithful, lo they made an oath of allegiance to thee under the tree." (Surah 48, v. 18.) And they said unto them, "since the mercy of Allah is visited upon one who God knows will die in faith, it must follow that those who took the oath under the tree should be among those to whom mercy is shown. 'Alī and Ṭalḥah and al-Zubair were among them, but 'Uthmān was a prisoner on that day, and the prophet promised allegiance to them, putting his own hand in the place of 'Uthmān's. By this means is proven the falsity of those who consider these four to be unbelievers."

7. *Concerning the Shu'aibīyah.* In their views about predestination, freedom of choice, and will they agree with the view of the Khāzimīyah. Any possible account of the

Shu'aibīyah appears first when their leader, Shu'aib,[1] differed with a man of the Khawārij whose name was Maimūn. Their cause of difference was that Shu'aib owed Maimūn money, over which they had a law suit, and Shu'aib said to him, " I will pay thee, if Allah desires." Maimūn answered, " Allah has already desired it this minute." So Shu'aib replied, " If he has really desired it, I can have done nothing but paid it." And Maimūn said, " Allah has commanded thee to do this, and he commands only what he desires, while that which he does not desire he does not command." It was after this that the 'Ajāridah were divided, some of them following Shu'aib and the rest Maimūn.

Regarding this point they wrote to 'Abd-al-Karīm ibn-'Ajrad who was then imprisoned by the Sultan, and in answer to them he wrote, " We say that what Allah desires happens, and what he does not desire does not happen, and we do not impute evil to Allah." This answer arrived after the death of ibn-'Ajrad. Maimūn claimed that 'Ajrad had
5 decided according to his [Maimūn's] opinion because he said, " We do not impute evil to Allah." Shu'aib, however, said, " No, he agreed with me because he said, we hold the opinion that what Allah desires happens, and what he does not desire does not happen." The Khāzimīyah, and most of the 'Ajāridah, sympathized with Shu'aib, while the Ḥamzīyah and the Ḳadarīyah sympathized with Maimūn.

The Maimūnīyah then added to their unbeliefs in regard to predestination a kind of Magianism. They permitted marriage with granddaughters on both sides; and they believed it was a divine command to fight a tyrannical ruler, and whoever was satisfied with his rule. As to anyone who refused their view, they do not believe in killing him except

---

[1] *Ibid.*, vol. i, p. 146.

when he is opposed to them, attacks their religion, or acts as guide to the undesirable ruler. In the next chapter, if Allah pleases, we shall mention the Maimūnīyah among the sects of the Ghulāt who deserted the true faith. Now there was a man among the Maimūnīyah called Khalaf who differed from the Maimūnīyah as to predestination as well as freedom of choice, and will. In these three things he agreed with the view of the Sunnites; he was followed by the Khawārij of Karmān and Mukrān. They were, therefore, called Khalafīyah and are the ones who fought Ḥamzah ibn-Akrak al-Khārijī [1] in the land of Karmān.

8. *Concerning the Khalafīyah.* These are the followers of Khalaf,[2] who fought Ḥamzah al-Khārijī. The Khalafīyah do not believe in fighting except under an Imām. This forced them to withhold from fighting because of the lack of anyone among them suited to be an Imām. These Khalafīyah tended to agree with the Azāriḳah in one thing, namely, they believed that the children of their opponents are in hell. 76

9. *Concerning the Ma'lūmīyah and the Majhūlīyah.*[3] These sects are branches of the main Khāzimīyah. The Ma'lūmīyah differed from their predecessors the Khāzimīyah in two things, namely, they claimed that whoever did not recognize Allah by all his names, that man was ignorant of him (Allah), and anyone ignorant of him was an unbeliever. Secondly, they said that the acts of men are not [4] created by Allah. They agreed, however, concerning freedom of choice, and will, with the Sunnites, holding that freedom of choice goes with the deed, and that it cannot be carried out unless Allah wishes. This sect claimed the right

---

[1] Shahrastānī gives Adrak, vol. i, p. 144.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. i, p. 145.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. i, p. 151.

[4] Shahrastānī has " are created," without the negative.

of the Imāmate for someone in its own group, who goes out with the sword against his enemies; they did not, however, excommunicate those among them who were Abstainers.

As to the Majhūlīyah, their views are like those of the Ma'lūmīyah except that they hold that he who recognizes Allah by some of his names (if not all) really knows him, and in this matter they condemned the Ma'lūmīyah as unbelievers.

10. *Concerning the Ṣaltīyah.*[1] These take their name from Ṣalt ibn-'Uthmān, who is also called ibn-abī-al-Ṣalt. He belonged to the 'Ajāridah, except that he said: "When a man agrees with us and becomes a Moslem, we accept him, but not his children, for they are not real Moslems until they are of age, when they are invited into Islam and accept it."

Side by side with this sect was another sect, the ninth sect of the 'Ajāridah, who claimed that neither the children of believers nor the children of polytheists were friends or foes until they had attained maturity, when they were invited to Islam and received or refused it.

11. *Concerning the Ḥamzīyah.* These are the followers
77 of Ḥamzah ibn-Akrak (see above) who laid waste Sijistān, Khurāsān, Mukrān,[2] Ḳuhistān,[3] and Karmān, and defeated their big armies. He at first belonged to the 'Ajāridah of the Khāzimīyah, but came to differ from them over predestination and freedom of choice, agreeing in these matters with the Ḳadarīyah. The Khāzimīyah, therefore, condemned him as unbelieving in this respect. Moreover, he claimed that the children of polytheists are condemned to

---

[1] Not given by Shahrastānī. M. Horten, *Die Philosophischen Systeme der speculativen Theologen im Islam*, p. 62.

[2] De Goeje, *ibid.*, vol. vi, p. 242, country next to Karmān.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 49.

hell, for which view the Ḳadarīyah condemned him as an unbeliever. He then made a covenant with the Abstainers among the Khawārij, in consonance with his views on the abjuration of whoever does not agree with him on the subject of fighting those within the sects of this religion who disagree with his view, calling them polytheists. Wherever he fought and defeated some enemy he commanded their possessions to be burned and their animals slaughtered, and at the same time killed the prisoners taken from those who disagreed with him. His appearance was in the days of Harūn al-Rashīd, in the year 179. His uprising lasted until the early part of the caliphate of al-Ma'mūn. When he took possession of some provinces, he installed as his Ḳāḍī over them abū-Yaḥya Yūsuf ibn-Bashshār, as leader of his army a man by the name of Jīwaih ibn-Ma'bad, and as leader of his bodyguard 'Amr ibn-Ṣā'id. Many of the poets of the Khawārij joined him, such as Ṭalḥah ibn-Fahd, abū-l-Julandī and others. He started hostilities against the Baihasīyah of the Khawārij, most of whom he killed, so that it was after this that he was called the *Commander of the Faithful.* The poet Ṭalḥah ibn-Fahd said about this:

> "The *Commander of the Faithful* is on the right way and under the best of guidance,
> What a marvelous commander, surpassing the other commanders just as the shining moon surpasses the small star."

It was after this that Ḥamzah made a raid against the 78
Khāzimīyah among the Khawārij in a part of the country known as Faljard,[1] killing great numbers of them. Then he himself went to Hirāt,[2] whose people prevented him from entering it, but he fought those outside of the city and put them to the sword. Then 'Amr ibn-Yazīd al-Azdī, who at

---

[1] *Ibid.*, vols. iii-iv, index.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. vi, p. 18, province of Khurāsān.

this time was governor of Hirāt, came against him with an army. The battle between them lasted for months. A great many from the land of Hirāt were killed, including the Schismatics, the followers of Haiṣam al-Shāri.[1] The missionaries of Ḥamzah urged the people to join in his error.

Ḥamzah then attacked Karūkh in the vicinity of Hirāt, burning the possessions of the people and laying waste their trees. After this he fought ‘Amr ibn-Yazīd al-Azdī in the neighborhood of Būshanj (or kh?),[2] in a battle in which ‘Amr was killed. ‘Alī ibn-‘Īsa ibn-Hādiyān, who was then governor of Khurasān, now took part in the war against Ḥamzah, who was forced to flee from him into the land of Sijistān after he had killed sixty men of his leaders, not to mention his followers. When he reached Sijistān, the people of Zaranj [3] prevented his entering their town, so he slaughtered some of them with the sword in the wastes near the town. He then disguised himself from them (the people of Zaranj) by putting his followers into black, which gave them the appearance of being the followers of the Sultan.[4] They were warned of this, however, and succeeded in preventing his entrance into their city. He therefore laid waste the palms in their forests and killed those passing through their wastes. He then went in the direction of the river Sha‘bah and there killed most of the Khalafīyah from among the Khawārij, cutting down their trees, burning their possessions, and driving away their leader called Mas‘ūd ibn-Ḳais, who in his flight fell into the river he was crossing. His followers are in doubt about his death, and
79 still look for his appearance. Ḥamzah thereupon returned

---

[1] Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 119.

[2] De Goeje, *ibid.*, vol. vi, p. 18, province of Khurāsān.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. vi, p. 50, town in Sijistān.

[4] The ‘Abbaside party wore black. Banning, *Muḥammed ibn al-Ḥanafīja*, p. 72. *Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale*, vol. v, p. 439.

from Karmān, and on his way fell upon the district of Bust, one of the districts of Nīsābūr, where he killed some of the Tha‘ālibah Khawārij who were there. This uprising in Khurāsān, Karmān, Ḳahistān and Sijistān lasted till the end of the days of al-Rashīd, and the beginning of the caliphate of al-Ma’mūn, because the greater part of the army of Khurāsān was busy fighting Rāfi‘ ibn-Laith ibn-Naṣr ibn-Saiyār [1] at the gate of Samarḳand.

When al-Ma’mūn came into the caliphate he wrote Ḥamzah a letter in which he demanded his adherence, which merely increased Ḥamzah's pride. Al-Ma’mūn, therefore, sent Ṭāhir ibn-al-Ḥusain [2] to fight Ḥamzah, and a war followed between Ṭāhir and Ḥamzah. About thirty thousand were killed on both sides, most of them being followers of Ḥamzah. In this battle Ḥamzah was driven to Karmān. Then Ṭāhir attacked the Abstainers who agreed with Ḥamzah in theory, and captured three hundred of them. He then commanded that all the men be bound together with ropes between two trees whose tops had been made to touch one another; the man between the two trees was then cut in half, and each one of the two trees bounded back with half of the body bound to it. After this al-Ma’mūn recalled Ṭāhir ibn-al-Ḥusain from Khurāsān, and sent him to his headquarters. Ḥamzah now became very covetous of Khurāsān and proceeded from Karmān with an army. He was met by ‘Abd-al-Raḥmān al-Nīsābūri, with twenty thousand strong from Nīsābūr and vicinity. With the help of Allah, Ḥamzah was put to flight and thousands of his followers killed. Ḥamzah ran away while wounded, and died during the flight. By his death Allah gave the world relief 80
from him and from his followers. This battle, after which Ḥamzah the Khārijite and Ḳadarite perished, was one of

---

[1] Ṭabarī-Zotenberg, vol. iv, p. 471 *et seq.*

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 484 *et seq.*

the events of which the people of Nīsābūr boasted, praise Allah for this.

12. *Concerning the Tha'ālibah.* These are the followers of Tha'labah ibn-Mashkān.[1] The Tha'ālibah claim his Imāmate as a successor to 'Abd-al-Karīm ibn-'Ajrad. It is claimed that 'Abd-al-Karīm ibn-'Ajrad was Imām until Tha'labah differed from him over the judgment of children. When the two differed over this ibn-'Ajrad was condemned and Tha'labah became Imām. The reason for their difference was that a man of the 'Ajāridah asked Tha'labah for his daughter's hand, whereupon Tha'labah said to him: " Show her dowry." The suitor then sent a woman to the mother of the daughter to ask her if the daughter was of age, for if she was of age and had embraced Islam, according to the stipulations which the 'Ajāridah require, it did not matter what her dowry was. Her mother said: " Whether she be of age or not, since her guardian is a Moslem, she is one." 'Abd-al-Karīm ibn-'Ajrad was notified of this, as well as Tha'labah ibn-Mashkān. 'Abd-al-Karīm preferred to maintain the independence of children before maturity, while Tha'labah said: " We remain their guardians whether they be young or mature until they make clear to us that they are going to turn away from the truth." When they differed over this, each one of them threw off the responsibility of the sin of the other, and their respective followers were divided into two sects. The sects of the 'Ajāridah we have already mentioned. The Tha'ālibah subdivided into six sects. One of them held to the Imāmate of Tha'labah and accepted no other Imām after him, unmoved by the fact that there arose among them different opinions held by the 'Akhnasīyah and the Ma'badīyah.

---

[1] Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 147 gives Tha'labah ibn-'Āmir instead of ibn-Mashkān.

13. *Concerning the Ma'badīyah.* The second sect was 81 the Ma'badīyah, who claimed that the Imām succeeding the Tha'ālibah was one of their people by the name of Ma'bad.[1] This man disagreed with all of the Tha'ālibah over the question of taking alms from, and giving alms to slaves. He condemned as unbelievers those who did not accept this view, while the rest of the Tha'ālibah condemned him as unbelieving because he held this view.

14. *Concerning the Akhnasīyah.* The third sect was the Akhnasīyah, followers of one of their people who was known as al-Akhnas. At the beginning of his career he agreed with the views of the Tha'ālibah concerning the guardianship of children. But later he withdrew from them. saying: " We must oppose all those living in a land where dissembling is sanctioned.[2] Only when the faith of the man in question is known to us should we definitely accept him. And likewise only when his heresy is definitely known to us should we rid ourselves of him." He forbade murder and theft in secret, and also claimed that none of the people of the Ḳiblah should begin a fight without being specially called for it, unless the enemy is personally known. In this view he had many followers. Indeed he was rejected by the rest of the Tha'ālibah, but he in turn rejected them.

15. *Concerning the Shaibānīyah.* The fourth sect of the Tha'ālibah is the Shaibānīyah, followers of Shaibān ibn-Salamah al-Khārijī, who separated from the rest in the days of abū-Muslim, the founder of the dynasty of the banu-al-'Abbās. He helped abū-Muslim in his wars against his enemies, and in addition held the doctrine of the likeness of Allah to his creatures. The rest of the Tha'ālibah, together with the Sunnites, condemned his view as anthropo-

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 148.

[2] See note 1, p. 110.

morphic. In addition all of the Khawārij condemned him for upholding abū-Muslim. Those of the Tha'ālibah who condemned him were called the Ziyādīyah, the followers of Ziyād ibn-'Abd-al-Raḥmān.[1] The Shaibānīyah claim that
82 Shaibān repented of his sins, while the Ziyādīyah said that among his sins was that of doing violence to the worshippers of Allah, a crime for which repentance could not atone. However, he went on aiding abū-Muslim in fighting the Tha'ālibah, just as he had aided him in fighting the banū-'Umaīyah.

16. *Concerning the Rashīdīyah.* The fifth sect of the Tha'ālibah is called Rashīdīyah after a man by the name of Rashīd. Its peculiar belief is that land which is watered by springs and flowing rivers should pay half the tithe, the complete tithe being paid on land watered by rain only. Ziyād ibn-'Abd-al-Raḥmān differed from them, saying that land watered by springs and flowing rivers should also pay full tithe.

17. Concerning the *Mukarramīyah.* The sixth division of the Tha'ālibah is called the Mukarramīyah, followers of abū-Mukarram.[2] They claim that he who neglects prayer is an unbeliever, not because of the fact of his neglect of prayer, but because of his ignorance of Allah. They claimed, moreover, that all sinners were ignorant of Allah, and that ignorance constitutes unbelief. They also held to the doctrine that Allah's enmity and friendship depend on a man's religious attitude at death. Such are the sects of the Tha'ālibah and their views.

18. *Concerning the Ibāḍīyah and their sects.* The Ibāḍīyah, although divided over many things, agreed in acknowledging the Imāmate of 'Abdallāh ibn-Ibāḍ.[3] An-

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 149.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 150.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 151.

other point in which they agreed was the view that the unbelievers of this community, *i. e.* those of their community who differed from them, were both free from polytheism, and at the same time wanting in faith, thus being neither believers nor polytheists, but unbelievers. They accepted the testimony of such however, and secretly forbade the shedding of their blood, although publicly claimed it was lawful. 83
They also countenanced intermarriage with them, as well as inheritance from them. In this they claimed that such persons are fighting for Allah and his Prophet, although they are not true confessors of Islam. In addition, they considered some kinds of property owned by those who disagree with them as permissible to seize, while other kinds, for example horses and arms, are forbidden. As for their gold and silver, they considered it best to return it to its owners, when it is seized.

There were four definite differences which split up the Ibāḍīyah. The names of the groups adhering to the different views were: the Ḥafṣīyah, the Ḥārithīyah, the Yazīdīyah, and the "Aṣḥāb Ṭā'ah" (*i. e.* those who do pious deeds without the intention of pleasing Allah). Among these the Yazīdīyah belong to the Ghulāt, because they believe in the abrogation of the divine law of Islam at the end of time. This we will mention later in the chapter on the Ghulāt sects connected with Islam. In this chapter, however, we will mention only the Ḥafṣīyah, the Ḥārithīyah, and the Aṣhab Ṭā'ah (those who do pious deeds without the intention of pleasing Allah).

19. *Concerning the Ḥafṣīyah.* This sect acknowledges the Imāmate of Ḥafṣ ibn-abī-l-Miḳdām,[1] who was the one who held that there was but one thing that lay between polytheism and belief, namely, the knowledge of Allah alone.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 153.

morphic. In addition all of the Khawārij condemned him for upholding abū-Muslim. Those of the Tha‘ālibah who condemned him were called the Ziyādīyah, the followers of Ziyād ibn-‘Abd-al-Raḥmān.[1] The Shaibānīyah claim that
82 Shaibān repented of his sins, while the Ziyādīyah said that among his sins was that of doing violence to the worshippers of Allah, a crime for which repentance could not atone. However, he went on aiding abū-Muslim in fighting the Tha‘ālibah, just as he had aided him in fighting the banū-'Umaīyah.

16. *Concerning the Rashīdīyah.* The fifth sect of the Tha‘ālibah is called Rashīdīyah after a man by the name of Rashīd. Its peculiar belief is that land which is watered by springs and flowing rivers should pay half the tithe, the complete tithe being paid on land watered by rain only. Ziyād ibn-‘Abd-al-Raḥmān differed from them, saying that land watered by springs and flowing rivers should also pay full tithe.

17. Concerning the *Mukarramīyah.* The sixth division of the Tha‘ālibah is called the Mukarramīyah, followers of abū-Mukarram.[2] They claim that he who neglects prayer is an unbeliever, not because of the fact of his neglect of prayer, but because of his ignorance of Allah. They claimed, moreover, that all sinners were ignorant of Allah, and that ignorance constitutes unbelief. They also held to the doctrine that Allah's enmity and friendship depend on a man's religious attitude at death. Such are the sects of the Tha‘ālibah and their views.

18. *Concerning the Ibāḍīyah and their sects.* The Ibāḍīyah, although divided over many things, agreed in acknowledging the Imāmate of ‘Abdallāh ibn-Ibāḍ.[3] An-

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 149.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 150.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 151.

other point in which they agreed was the view that the unbelievers of this community, *i. e.* those of their community who differed from them, were both free from polytheism, and at the same time wanting in faith, thus being neither believers nor polytheists, but unbelievers. They accepted the testimony of such however, and secretly forbade the shedding of their blood, although publicly claimed it was lawful. 83
They also countenanced intermarriage with them, as well as inheritance from them. In this they claimed that such persons are fighting for Allah and his Prophet, although they are not true confessors of Islam. In addition, they considered some kinds of property owned by those who disagree with them as permissible to seize, while other kinds, for example horses and arms, are forbidden. As for their gold and silver, they considered it best to return it to its owners, when it is seized.

There were four definite differences which split up the Ibāḍīyah. The names of the groups adhering to the different views were: the Ḥafṣīyah, the Ḥārithīyah, the Yazīdīyah, and the "Aṣḥāb Ṭā‘ah" (*i. e.* those who do pious deeds without the intention of pleasing Allah). Among these the Yazīdīyah belong to the Ghulāt, because they believe in the abrogation of the divine law of Islam at the end of time. This we will mention later in the chapter on the Ghulāt sects connected with Islam. In this chapter, however, we will mention only the Ḥafṣīyah, the Ḥārithīyah, and the Aṣḥab Ṭā‘ah (those who do pious deeds without the intention of pleasing Allah).

19. *Concerning the Ḥafṣīyah.* This sect acknowledges the Imāmate of Ḥafṣ ibn-abī-l-Miḳdām,[1] who was the one who held that there was but one thing that lay between polytheism and belief, namely, the knowledge of Allah alone.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 153.

Accordingly, the man who knew Allah, but later came to disbelieve in other matters, such as his Prophet, paradise, hell, forbidden deeds, killing oneself, or the permission of adultery and the rest of the forbidden sins, that man is an unbeliever, but is nevertheless free from polytheism. He, on the other hand, who is ignorant of Allah, and denies him, is a polytheist. Their explanation of the case of ʻUthmān ibn-ʻAffān was similar to that of al-Rāfiḍah in regard to abū-Bakr and ʻUmar. They also claim that ʻAlī was the one to whom Allah referred when he revealed the following: "A man there is who surpriseth thee by his discourse concerning this present life. He taketh God to witness what is in his heart; yet is he the most zealous in
84 opposing thee" (Surah 2, v. 200); while ʻAbd-al-Raḥmān ibn-Muljim was the one to whom Allah referred when he said, "A man too there is who sells his very self out of desire to please God." (Surah 2, v. 203.) In addition to all this they went on to say that belief in the books and the prophets is connected with belief in the unity of Allah. And any man disagreeing with this was a polytheist. This last view is contradictory to their first view that the difference between polytheism and unbelief lies in the knowledge of Allah alone, and that he who knew Allah is free from polytheism even if he rejects the rest of the beliefs, *i. e.* the Prophet, paradise and hell. Their views thus became contradictory in this matter.

20. *Concerning the Ḥārithīyah.* These are the followers of Ḥārith ibn-Mazīd al-Ibāḍī.[1] It was they who agreed with the Muʻtazilah in regard to fate. They claimed also that ability precedes any deed, a view for which the rest of the Ibāḍīyah condemned them, because it was contrary to the views of the Sunnites to the effect that Allah creates the

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 153.

deeds of his servants, and that ability comes only in conjunction with the deed. The Ḥārithīyah claimed that the only Imāms they had had since the first Muḥakkimah were ʻAbdallāh ibn-Ibāḍī and that after him came Ḥārith ibn-Mazīd al-Ibāḍī.

21. *Concerning the Aṣḥāb Ṭāʻah who do pious deeds without the intention of pleasing Allah.* This sect claims that it is true that there exist many acts of obedience [virtues] that are not meant to please Allah. Abū-al-Hudhail (see below) and his followers among the Ḳadarīyah also asserted this; but our followers said that this is true only in one case, that is, during the first intuition of man. When a man is guided [1] by such intuition, he is obedient to Allah 85
in his deed, even though he had not intended to draw near to Allah by performing it, because it is impossible for him to draw near to Allah before he really knows him. But when he has once learned to know Allah, then, after this knowledge, any obedience on his part to Allah is not accounted to him as righteousness, unless he intended thereby to draw near to Allah. All the Ibāḍīyah, however, claim that the houses of their opponents among the people of Meccah are places where the unity of Allah is proclaimed, with the exception of the camp of the sultan, for his is the abode of a tyrant. Over hypocrisy they differed in three ways, one sect saying that hypocrisy is not included either in polytheism or in faith. As their reason they gave the words of Allah on hypocrites: "Wavering between the one and the other, belonging neither to these nor to those." (Ṣurah 4, v. 142.) Another sect said: "All hypocrisy is polytheism, because it is opposed to unity." The third sect said: "We do not separate the word 'hypocrisy' from its proper usage, nor do we call any people hypocrites, except those whom

---

[1] Read *istadall* and not *istadhall*.

Accordingly, the man who knew Allah, but later came to disbelieve in other matters, such as his Prophet, paradise, hell, forbidden deeds, killing oneself, or the permission of adultery and the rest of the forbidden sins, that man is an unbeliever, but is nevertheless free from polytheism. He, on the other hand, who is ignorant of Allah, and denies him, is a polytheist. Their explanation of the case of 'Uthmān ibn-'Affān was similar to that of al-Rāfiḍah in regard to abū-Bakr and 'Umar. They also claim that 'Alī was the one to whom Allah referred when he revealed the following: "A man there is who surpriseth thee by his discourse concerning this present life. He taketh God to witness what is in his heart; yet is he the most zealous in
84 opposing thee" (Surah 2, v. 200); while 'Abd-al-Raḥmān ibn-Muljim was the one to whom Allah referred when he said, "A man too there is who sells his very self out of desire to please God." (Surah 2, v. 203.) In addition to all this they went on to say that belief in the books and the prophets is connected with belief in the unity of Allah. And any man disagreeing with this was a polytheist. This last view is contradictory to their first view that the difference between polytheism and unbelief lies in the knowledge of Allah alone, and that he who knew Allah is free from polytheism even if he rejects the rest of the beliefs, *i. e.* the Prophet, paradise and hell. Their views thus became contradictory in this matter.

20. *Concerning the Ḥārithīyah.* These are the followers of Ḥārith ibn-Mazīd al-Ibāḍī.[1] It was they who agreed with the Mu'tazilah in regard to fate. They claimed also that ability precedes any deed, a view for which the rest of the Ibāḍīyah condemned them, because it was contrary to the views of the Sunnites to the effect that Allah creates the

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 153.

deeds of his servants, and that ability comes only in conjunction with the deed. The Ḥārithīyah claimed that the only Imāms they had had since the first Muḥakkimah were 'Abdallāh ibn-Ibāḍī and that after him came Ḥārith ibn-Mazīd al-Ibāḍī.

21. *Concerning the Aṣḥāb Ṭā'ah who do pious deeds without the intention of pleasing Allah.* This sect claims that it is true that there exist many acts of obedience [virtues] that are not meant to please Allah. Abū-al-Hudhail (see below) and his followers among the Ḳadarīyah also asserted this; but our followers said that this is true only in one case, that is, during the first intuition of man. When
a man is guided[1] by such intuition, he is obedient to Allah 85
in his deed, even though he had not intended to draw near to Allah by performing it, because it is impossible for him to draw near to Allah before he really knows him. But when he has once learned to know Allah, then, after this knowledge, any obedience on his part to Allah is not accounted to him as righteousness, unless he intended thereby to draw near to Allah. All the Ibāḍīyah, however, claim that the houses of their opponents among the people of Meccah are places where the unity of Allah is proclaimed, with the exception of the camp of the sultan, for his is the abode of a tyrant. Over hypocrisy they differed in three ways, one sect saying that hypocrisy is not included either in polytheism or in faith. As their reason they gave the words of Allah on hypocrites: "Wavering between the one and the other, belonging neither to these nor to those." (Ṣurah 4, v. 142.) Another sect said: "All hypocrisy is polytheism, because it is opposed to unity." The third sect said: "We do not separate the word 'hypocrisy' from its proper usage, nor do we call any people hypocrites, except those whom

---

[1] Read *istadall* and not *istadhall.*

Allah has called hypocrites." Those of them who said that the hypocrite is not a polytheist, claimed that those who were hypocrites in the time of the prophet of Allah were unitarians, and at the same time major sinners; thus being unbelievers, even though they did not come within the category of polytheists.

'Abd-al-Ḳāhir states: "After all we have related about them, (we see that) the peculiarity of their views sets them apart from the rest. Among these peculiarities are those held by the party which claims that there was no proof for mankind of the unity of Allah and his divine and other attributes, except through information, or that which takes its place along the line of signs and suggestions." Another party said that the law and the commands of Islam are binding on whomever enters the religion of Islam, whether or not he has heard or known them. The rest of 86 this sect say a man does not sin in doing something about which he knows nothing, except when the proof [of its sinfulness] has been given him. Still others say it is possible for Allah to send to his creatures a prophet with no sign to prove his veracity. Others, however, contend that whoever attains the knowledge that Allah has forbidden wine, or that he has caused the Ḳiblah to be changed, must be certain whether the one who informs him of this is a believer or an unbeliever. Moreover, it is incumbent upon him to know this through information,[1] although he need not necessarily know that this has come to him through information. The view of still others is that *going on foot* to prayer, or *riding* or *traveling* to the Ḥajj or any of the *means* which help to fulfil that which is required, are of no account. What is incumbent is the doing of the deed, regardless of the *means* used in its attainment. All parties

---

[1] For definition of *information* in this sense see Lane on *khabar* as contrasted with *Ḥadīth*.

agree that it is right to ask anyone who differs from them with regard to the text of the Koran or its interpretation, to return to their way of thinking. And if such a person does recant, it is well; if not, he must be killed—it being immaterial whether this difference related to something about which he was ignorant, or to something about which he was not ignorant. They also said that he who commits adultery or steals should be assigned the legal punishment and then given a chance to repent. If he repents, it is all right; if not, he must be put to death. They said also that the world will pass away when Allah has caused the people who have observed the law to disappear, this being possible because he created it only for them. The Ibāḍīyah accepted the possibility of conflicting ordinances existing over one and the same thing. For example, in the case of a man who goes into a sown field without the permission of the owner, this would be breaking a commandment; but according to another command, Allah has forbidden his going out of the field, because that would be harmful to the seed, which he has been commanded to plant. They said, moreover, the fleer in war is not (to be) pursued, if he is one of 87 the people of the Ḳiblah, and is a believer in the unity of Allah. On the other hand, we receive no women and slaves from them. They consider it permissible to kill anthropomorphists and to pursue those who flee, as well as to seize their women and children as prisoners. They held that this was what abū-Bakr did to apostates.

There was a man of the Ibāḍīyah known as Ibrāhīm, who invited some of the members of his sect to his dwelling, and gave one of his slaves, who belonged to the same sect, an order. When she delayed over it, he swore he would sell her to the Arabs, but one of the men whose name was Maimūn, not the leader of the Maimūnīyah among the 'Ajāridah, said to him: "How wilt thou sell a believing slave to an unbeliever?" And Ibrāhīm said to him: "Allah has permitted such a sale, and the followers of our sect who passed before us have also always permitted it." Maimūn left the sect, but the rest were uncertain about it, so they wrote to their 'Ulamas, who answered that such a sale was permissible, and that Maimūn should be brought to repentance, as well as those who were in doubt concerning the action of Ibrāhīm. The result of all this was that three sects arose, the Ibrāhīmīyah, the Maimūnīyah, and the Wāḳifah. Owing to the question of the legality of this sale, Ibrāhīm gathered quite a following, who came to be known as the Ḍaḥḥākīyah. This group permitted the marriage of a Moslem woman to an unbeliever in a country where dissembling is sanctioned.[1] But in the case of those who are in a country where their own sect is in the ascendance, this is not permitted. Some were uncertain over this question, saying about the wife: "If she dies we will not say prayers over her, nor will we accept her inheritance, because we do not know what her legal condition is."

After the Ibrāhīmīyah, there arose a party called the Baihasīyah, followers of abū-Baihas Haiṣam ibn-'Āmir.[2]
88 These say that Maimūn was an unbeliever, because he forbade the sale of a woman in a region where dissembling is sanctioned, and which is inhabited by the unbelievers of our people. The Wāḳifah were heretics because they did not recognize Maimūn's heresy and Ibrāhīm's orthodoxy. Ibrāhīm, on the other hand, was a heretic because he did not disclaim the Wāḳifah. They said: "The reason for this is because uncertainty exists only in connection with bodies; the uncertainty with regard to a judgment can occur only where no one agrees with it, for if one Moslem agrees with it, he who is present cannot help knowing him who

---

[1] Goldziher, *Das Prinzip der taḳijja im Islam*, *Z. D. M. G.*, vol. lx, p. 213.

[2] Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 139; vol. ii, p. 405.

knows the truth and acts on it, and him who knows the untruth and acts on it." Then the Baihasīyah said: "We do not call him who commits a sin a heretic until he is brought to the governor and punished, so that before he is brought to the governor, we call him neither a believer nor a heretic." Some of the Baihasīyah said: "When the Imām becomes an unbeliever, his followers also become unbelievers." Others said: "All drinks are originally permissible. He, therefore, who drinks is forgiven everything which he does when drunk, such as neglecting prayer and scorning Allah. He can neither be punished nor considered a heretic as long as he is drunk." Still others of the Baihasīyah, called the 'Aufīyah, said: "Drunkenness is heresy if during drunkenness prayer is neglected, or a similar offense is committed." The 'Aufīyah divided off from the Baihasīyah and separated into two sects. One sect said: "We repudiate those who desert us after having left home and joined us, fighting in our ranks." The other sect said: "No, we would keep such an one, because he would then be returning to a state that was legal for him before he came to us." Both sects say that if the Imām is heretical, his followers, whether present or absent, are also heretical. Besides the Ibāḍīyah, the Baihasīyah formed the subsects which we have mentioned in the *Kitāb al-Milal wa'l-Niḥal*. This, 89
therefore, is all we have to say of them in this book.

21. *Concerning the Shabībīyah.* They are known as al-Shabībīyah because they owe their origin to Shabīb ibn-Yazīd al-Shaibānī, known as abū-l-Ṣaḥārā. They were also known as the Ṣāliḥīyah after Ṣāliḥ ibn-Mishraḥ al-Khārijī. Shabīb ibn-Yazīd, the Khārijite, was one of the companions of Ṣaliḥ, and after him he took over the command of his army. The reason for this was that Ṣāliḥ ibn-Mishraḥ al-Tamīmī differed from the Azāriḳah by claiming that he was one of the Ṣifrīyah, while others said that he

slave to an unbeliever?" And Ibrāhīm said to him: "Allah has permitted such a sale, and the followers of our sect who passed before us have also always permitted it." Maimūn left the sect, but the rest were uncertain about it, so they wrote to their 'Ulamas, who answered that such a sale was permissible, and that Maimūn should be brought to repentance, as well as those who were in doubt concerning the action of Ibrāhīm. The result of all this was that three sects arose, the Ibrāhīmīyah, the Maimūnīyah, and the Wāḳifah. Owing to the question of the legality of this sale, Ibrāhīm gathered quite a following, who came to be known as the Ḍaḥḥākīyah. This group permitted the marriage of a Moslem woman to an unbeliever in a country where dissembling is sanctioned.[1] But in the case of those who are in a country where their own sect is in the ascendance, this is not permitted. Some were uncertain over this question, saying about the wife: "If she dies we will not say prayers over her, nor will we accept her inheritance, because we do not know what her legal condition is."

After the Ibrāhīmīyah, there arose a party called the Baihasīyah, followers of abū-Baihas Haiṣam ibn-'Āmir.[2] 88 These say that Maimūn was an unbeliever, because he forbade the sale of a woman in a region where dissembling is sanctioned, and which is inhabited by the unbelievers of our people. The Wāḳifah were heretics because they did not recognize Maimūn's heresy and Ibrāhīm's orthodoxy. Ibrāhīm, on the other hand, was a heretic because he did not disclaim the Wāḳifah. They said: "The reason for this is because uncertainty exists only in connection with bodies; the uncertainty with regard to a judgment can occur only where no one agrees with it, for if one Moslem agrees with it, he who is present cannot help knowing him who

---

[1] Goldziher, *Das Prinzip der taḳijja im Islam*, *Z. D. M. G.*, vol. lx, p. 213.

[2] Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 139; vol. ii, p. 405.

knows the truth and acts on it, and him who knows the untruth and acts on it." Then the Baihasīyah said: "We do not call him who commits a sin a heretic until he is brought to the governor and punished, so that before he is brought to the governor, we call him neither a believer nor a heretic." Some of the Baihasīyah said: "When the Imām becomes an unbeliever, his followers also become unbelievers." Others said: "All drinks are originally permissible. He, therefore, who drinks is forgiven everything which he does when drunk, such as neglecting prayer and scorning Allah. He can neither be punished nor considered a heretic as long as he is drunk." Still others of the Baihasīyah, called the 'Aufīyah, said: "Drunkenness is heresy if during drunkenness prayer is neglected, or a similar offense is committed." The 'Aufīyah divided off from the Baihasīyah and separated into two sects. One sect said: "We repudiate those who desert us after having left home and joined us, fighting in our ranks." The other sect said: "No, we would keep such an one, because he would then be returning to a state that was legal for him before he came to us." Both sects say that if the Imām is heretical, his followers, whether present or absent, are also heretical. Besides the Ibāḍīyah, the Baihasīyah formed the subsects which we have mentioned in the *Kitāb al-Milal wa'l-Niḥal*. This, 89 therefore, is all we have to say of them in this book.

21. *Concerning the Shabībīyah.* They are known as al-Shabībīyah because they owe their origin to Shabīb ibn-Yazīd al-Shaibānī, known as abū-l-Ṣaḥārā. They were also known as the Ṣāliḥīyah after Ṣāliḥ ibn-Mishraḥ al-Khārijī. Shabīb ibn-Yazīd, the Khārijite, was one of the companions of Ṣaliḥ, and after him he took over the command of his army. The reason for this was that Ṣāliḥ ibn-Mishraḥ al-Tamīmī differed from the Azāriḳah by claiming that he was one of the Ṣifrīyah, while others said that he

had been neither a Ṣifrī nor one of the Azāriḳah. In the days when Bishr ibn-Marwān was governor of al-Irāḳ under his brother ʻAbd-al-Malik ibn-Marwān, Ṣāliḥ rebelled against him. Bishr sent al-Ḥārith ibn-ʻUmair to fight him. Al-Mawāyinī says that Ṣāliḥ rebelled against al-Ḥajjāj ibn-Yūsuf,[1] and that it was al-Ḥajjāj who sent al-Ḥārith ibn-ʻUmair to fight him, and that the battle between the two came to a head before the gate of Fort Ḥalūla. Ṣāliḥ, having been defeated and wounded, took to flight, and being near to death he said to his companions: "I name Shabīb my successor over you. I know there are among you some who are more learned than he, but he is a brave man in the opinion of your enemies, and feared by them. He among you who is learned, let him help him with his knowledge." Therefore, as soon as he died, his followers paid allegiance to Shabīb, until he came to differ with Ṣāliḥ about a certain thing, *i. e.* he and some of his followers countenanced the Imāmate of one of their women, when she took a prominent place in their affairs, and led them out against their opponents. They claimed, moreover, that
90 Ghazālah, the mother of Shabīb, held the Imāmate after the murder of Shabīb, until she was killed. This they proved by the fact that when Shabīb entered al-Ḳūfah, he made his mother mount the pulpit of al-Kūfah, in order to preach. The historians report that at the beginning of these affairs, Shabīb went to Syria and came to Rūḥ ibn-Zinbāʻ[2] and said to him: "Ask the Amīr of the Faithful to assign a stipend for me, as one on the honor-roll; for I have a large following among the banu-Shaibān." So Rūḥ ibn-Zinbāʻ asked this of ʻAbd-al-Malik ibn-Marwān. But the latter replied: "I do not know this man, and I fear that he is a

---

[1] Ṭabarī, *ibid.*, vol. iv, pp. 7, 114 *et seq.*

[2] Ṭabarī-De Goeje, vol. ii, pp. 424, 460, 461.

Ḥarūrī."[1] So Rūḥ told Shabīb that ʻAbd-al-Malik ibn-Marwān denied any knowledge of him. Shabīb replied: "He will know me after this."

He then returned to the banu-Shaibān, and collected about a thousand men from among the Ṣāliḥīyah-Khawārij, with whom he took possession of the district which lay between Kaskar[2] and al-Madā'in. Al-Ḥajjāj sent ʻUbaid ibn-abī-l-Mukhāriḳ al-Mutannabī against him with a thousand horsemen, whom Shabīb defeated. He then sent against him ʻAbd-al-Raḥmān ibn-Muḥammad ibn-al-Ashʻath, whom Shabīb also defeated. Then he sent out ʻAttāb ibn-Warḳa' al-Tamīmī, whom Shabīb killed. This went on for two years, Shabīb putting to flight twenty of the armies of al-Ḥajjāj. He then fell upon al-Kūfah in the night, having a thousand of the Khawārij with him, as well as his mother Ghazālah[3] and his wife Jahzīyah with two hundred Khārijite women, who were armed with lances and girded with swords. When he surprised al-Ḳūfah in the night, he attacked the main mosque, killing the guard of the mosque and those praying in it, and he then made his mother Ghazālah mount the pulpit to preach. Khuraim ibn-Fātik al-Asadī says about 91
this:[4]

"Ghazālah used the sword to strike
The people of al-ʻIrāḳain for one whole year;
She went as high as al-ʻIrāḳain with an army,
She therefore caused al-ʻIrāḳain suffering."

His army being scattered, al-Ḥajjāj waited in his house

---

[1] Ḥarūrah is a place near al-Kūfah where the Khawārij opposing ʻAli lived. Ṭabarī-Zotenberg, vol. iii, p. 683.

[2] De Goeje, *ibid.*, vol. vi, p. 5, territory watered by the Tigris and Euphrates.

[3] Ṭabarī, *ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 892.

[4] *Kitāb al-Aghāni*, vol. xxi, pp. 13, 5. In vol. x, p. 85, *Khuraim* is read *Khuzaim.*

until he had gathered his troops around him in the morning. In the meantime, Shabīb led his companions in prayer in the mosque, and at the morning prayer he read the Surah of the Cow (Surah 2), and the Surah of the Family of 'Imrān (Surah 3). It was just at that point that al-Ḥajjāj came upon him with four thousand of his army, and the two parties fought in the market place of al-Kūfah, until the companions of Shabīb were killed, and Shabīb forced to flee to al-Anbār, with those who remained with him. Al-Ḥajjāj sent an army in pursuit, and drove Shabīb out of al-Anbār,[1] into al-Ahwāz. Al-Ḥajjāj sent Sufain ibn-al-Abrad al-Kalbī with three thousand men in pursuit of Shabīb. Sufain encamped on the banks of al-Dujail [Little Tigris], while Shabīb went to the bridge of Dujail to cross over to him. Sufain, however, commanded his followers to cut down the ropes of the bridge. The bridge, therefore, gave way and Shabīb fell into the water with his horse. This happened while he was repeating Surah 6, v. 96: "This is predestined (by Allah), the mighty, the knowing." The followers of Shabīb on the other side of al-Dujail then paid allegiance to Ghazālah, the mother of Shabīb. But Sufain ibn-Abrād mended the bridge and crossed with his army into the district of the Khawārij, killing most of them, including Ghazālah, the mother of Shabīb, and his wife Jahīzah,[2] and taking prisoner the rest of the followers of Shabīb. He also commanded the divers to bring the body of Shabīb out of the water, and he took his head and sent it
92 with the prisoners to al-Ḥajjāj. When the prisoners were brought before al-Ḥajjāj, he commanded that a certain man of them should be killed. That man had said to him:

---

[1] De Goeje, *ibid.*, vol. vi, p. 8.

[2] 'Abd al-Ḳāhir gives two readings. *Jahīzah* and *Jahzīyah.*

"Hear from me the two verses with which I will end my work." Whereupon he began reciting:

> "I will take refuge with Allah from 'Amr and his followers,
> And from 'Alī and the Companions of Ṣiffīn
> And from Mu'āwiyah, the tyrant, and his followers;
> Bless not, O Allah, the accursed people!"

Not only this man's death, but the death of many others was commanded. The rest were set free.

Says 'Abd-al-Ḳāhir to the Shabībīyah of the Khawārij: "It might be said, you discountenanced the departure of the Mother of the Faithful, 'Ā'ishah, to al-Baṣrah with her army, of which each member was *forbidden* [in marriage], because in the Koran she is the mother of all the faithful; and you claimed that she became a heretic because of this; and you applied to her the words of Allah: 'And abide still in your houses.' (Surah 33, v. 3.) Why don't you apply this verse also to Ghazālah, the mother of Shabīb, and so charge her, and the Khārijite women also, with heresy, who went to fight the armies of al-Ḥajjāj? Now, if you consider their action permissible, because their husbands, children or brothers were with them, then you should take into account that with 'Ā'ishah there were her brother 'Abd-al-Raḥmān, and her nephew 'Abdallāh ibn-al-Zubair, each one of whom was forbidden to her [in marriage]. Besides, all Moslems are her children, and therefore all are forbidden to her. If, then, some of you accept the Imāmate of Ghazālah, so that her Imāmate seems proper, why do you not consider 'Ā'ishah's act permissible?" Praise be to Allah for guarding us from heresy.

until he had gathered his troops around him in the morning. In the meantime, Shabīb led his companions in prayer in the mosque, and at the morning prayer he read the Surah of the Cow (Surah 2), and the Surah of the Family of 'Imrān (Surah 3). It was just at that point that al-Ḥajjāj came upon him with four thousand of his army, and the two parties fought in the market place of al-Kūfah, until the companions of Shabīb were killed, and Shabīb forced to flee to al-Anbār, with those who remained with him. Al-Ḥajjāj sent an army in pursuit, and drove Shabīb out of al-Anbār,[1] into al-Ahwāz. Al-Ḥajjāj sent Sufain ibn-al-Abrad al-Kalbī with three thousand men in pursuit of Shabīb. Sufain encamped on the banks of al-Dujail [Little Tigris], while Shabīb went to the bridge of Dujail to cross over to him. Sufain, however, commanded his followers to cut down the ropes of the bridge. The bridge, therefore, gave way and Shabīb fell into the water with his horse. This happened while he was repeating Surah 6, v. 96: "This is predestined (by Allah), the mighty, the knowing." The followers of Shabīb on the other side of al-Dujail then paid allegiance to Ghazālah, the mother of Shabīb. But Sufain ibn-Abrād mended the bridge and crossed with his army into the district of the Khawārij, killing most of them, including Ghazālah, the mother of Shabīb, and his wife Jahīzah,[2] and taking prisoner the rest of the followers of Shabīb. He also commanded the divers to bring the body of Shabīb out of the water, and he took his head and sent it
92 with the prisoners to al-Ḥajjāj. When the prisoners were brought before al-Ḥajjāj, he commanded that a certain man of them should be killed. That man had said to him:

---

[1] De Goeje, *ibid.*, vol. vi, p. 8.

[2] 'Abd al-Ḳāhir gives two readings. *Jahīzah* and *Jahzīyah*.

"Hear from me the two verses with which I will end my work." Whereupon he began reciting:

> "I will take refuge with Allah from 'Amr and his followers,
> And from 'Alī and the Companions of Ṣiffīn
> And from Mu'āwiyah, the tyrant, and his followers;
> Bless not, O Allah, the accursed people!"

Not only this man's death, but the death of many others was commanded. The rest were set free.

Says 'Abd-al-Ḳāhir to the Shabībīyah of the Khawārij: "It might be said, you discountenanced the departure of the Mother of the Faithful, 'Ā'ishah, to al-Baṣrah with her army, of which each member was *forbidden* [in marriage], because in the Koran she is the mother of all the faithful; and you claimed that she became a heretic because of this; and you applied to her the words of Allah: 'And abide still in your houses.' (Surah 33, v. 3.) Why don't you apply this verse also to Ghazālah, the mother of Shabīb, and so charge her, and the Khārijite women also, with heresy, who went to fight the armies of al-Ḥajjāj? Now, if you consider their action permissible, because their husbands, children or brothers were with them, then you should take into account that with 'Ā'ishah there were her brother 'Abd-al-Raḥmān, and her nephew 'Abdallāh ibn-al-Zubair, each one of whom was forbidden to her [in marriage]. Besides, all Moslems are her children, and therefore all are forbidden to her. If, then, some of you accept the Imāmate of Ghazālah, so that her Imāmate seems proper, why do you not consider 'Ā'ishah's act permissible?" Praise be to Allah for guarding us from heresy.

CHAPTER III

The Doctrines of the Erring Sects among the Mu'tazilite Ḳadarīyah

We have already mentioned the fact that the Mu'tazilah were divided into twenty sects, each one condemning the other as unorthodox. These twenty sects are: The Wāṣilīyah, the 'Amrīyah, the Hudhailīyah, the Naẓẓāmīyah, the Aswārīyah, the Mu'ammarīyah, the Iskāfīyah, the Ja'farīyah, the Bishrīyah, the Murdārīyah,[1] the Hishāmīyah, the Tamāmīyah, the Jāḥizīyah, the Ḥāyiṭīyah, the Ḥimārīyah, the Khaiyāṭīyah, and the followers of Ṣāliḥ Ḳubbah, the Muwaisīyah, the Shaḥḥāmīyah, the Ka'bīyah, the Jubābīyah, and the Bahshamīyah, who are named after abū-Hāshim ibn-al-Jubbā'ī. This makes a total of twenty-two sects, two sects belonging to the heretical groups of the Ghulāt. Those we will mention in the chapter dealing with the sects of the Ghulāt, they being the Ḥāyiṭīyah and the Ḥimārīyah. The other twenty are pure Ḳadarīyah, all agreeing in certain heretical doctrines, *e. g.* the common denial that Allah has eternal qualities; the affirmation that Allah has neither knowledge, nor power, nor life, nor hearing, nor seeing, nor any eternal attribute; together with their view that
94 Allah never had a name or an attribute. They claim, furthermore, that it is impossible for Allah to see with his eyes. They say that he himself does not see, nor does anyone see him. They differ, however, over the question as

---

[1] Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, gives *Mazdārīyah*, but *Murdārīyah* is correct. *Cf.* Goldziher's article in Z. D. M. G., vol. lxv, p. 363.

to whether Allah can see things better than himself or not, some saying yes, and others no. But they agree in the view that the Word of Allah is created as well as his "thou shalt"; his "thou shalt not" and his revelation. All claim that the Word of Allah has a beginning, and most of them today call his Word created. They also agree that Allah is not a creator of the paths of men, nor of any of the deeds of animals. They hold, on the other hand, however, that it is man who determines his own affairs, without any interference on the part of Allah, either in these affairs of men or of any of the deeds of animals. It is because of this view that the Moslems call them Ḳadarīyah.[1] Another thing in which they agree, is the claim that the sinner within the Islamic religion belongs to a class between the two recognized classes, *i. e.* that he is a sinner, but neither a believer, nor an unbeliever. Because of this the Moslems call them Mu'tazilah,[2] since they secede from the views of the community as a whole.

Furthermore, they agreed in the view that nothing in the acts of his servants, which Allah did not command or forbid, was willed by him. In his treatise, al-Ka'bī[3] claimed that the Mu'tazilah agreed that Allah is a thing unlike ordinary things, that he is the creator of bodies and accidents, and everything which he created he created from nothing, and that all believers perform their acts according to what Allah preordains concerning them. He also says that they 95
agree that those who commit major sins are not forgiven unless they repent. In these last assertions of al-Ka'bī there are several mistakes with regard to his co-believers. He asserts, for example, that the Mu'tazilah agree that Allah is a thing unlike other things. As a matter of fact, accord-

---

[1] *Ḳadara* means to determine.

[2] *I'tazala* means to secede.

[3] *Cf.* above (pp. 27). This is the same *maḳālah* mentioned later.

ing to all the Mu'tazilah, the attribute of Allah does not belong to Allah alone. Al-Jubbā'ī and his son abū-Hāshim [1] have said: "All creative power is a thing unlike other things." They therefore do not limit this praise to their lord alone. Secondly, he is mistaken in his report that all the Mu'tazilah agree that Allah is the creator of bodies and of accidents, for it is known that the most determined of the Mu'tazilah exclude all accidents. Mu'ammar, among them, claims that Allah created none of the accidents; that derived accidents have no creator. How, then, can his claim be true that the Mu'tazilah agree that Allah is the creator of bodies and of accidents, since some of them ignore the existence of accidents, others assert their existence, claiming, however, that Allah did not create any of them, while others hold that derived accidents, which arise later [after creation], are accidents which have no creator. Al-Ka'bī, with the rest of the Mu'tazilah, says that Allah did not create the deeds of his worshipers. According to those believing in accidents, such deeds are accidents. Al-Ka'bī's mistake in this matter, with regard to his companions, for example, that the Mu'tazilah were agreed over the view that Allah created what he created from nothing, is therefore an accident. How could they have been agreed about this? Al-Ka'bī and the rest of the Mu'tazilah, with the exception of al-Ṣāliḥī,[2] claim that all occurrences were things before their occurrence. The Baṣri men among them 96 claim that substances and accidents were substances and accidents and things in their state of non-existence. The correct conclusion in this matter is that Allah creates one thing from another; the view that he creates a thing from nothing being true only according to the principle of the Ṣifātīyah, our co-believers, who deny the existence of un-

---

[1] *Cf.* below under Bahshamīyah.

[2] Horten, *ibid.*, p. 305.

real things. As to the claim that the Mu'tazilah agree that the faithful perform their acts as Allah has preordained them, this is a mistake on his [al-Ka'bī's] part, beecause Mu'ammar,[1] who was one of them, claimed that power is the act of a substance that is powerful, and not an act of Allah. The Aṣamm, among them, however, deny the substance of power because they deny all accidents. In the same way his claim that the Mu'tazilah agree that Allah does not forgive major sinners who have repented, is an error on his part concerning them, for three of their sheikhs who agreed with the Wāḳifīyah as to the punishments which threatened major sinners, Muḥammad ibn-Shabīb al-Baṣrī, al-Ṣāliḥī, and al-Khālidī considered it sometimes permissible for Allah to forgive such sins, even without repentance. In regard to what we have mentioned about the Mu'tazilah, al-Ka'bī has made a mistake. The Mu'tazilah agree in the matters we referred to. As to the matters over which they differ among themselves, those we shall mention in the section on their sects, please Allah.

1. *Concerning the Wāṣilīyah from among them.* These are the followers of Wāṣil ibn-'Aṭā al-Ghazzā,[2] the head of the Mu'tazilah, and their leader in their heresy after Ma'bad al-Juhanī and Ghailān al-Dimashḳī.[3] Wāṣil was 97 one of those who paid frequent visits to al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī [4] at the time of the rebellion of the Azāriḳah. At that time the people were divided into sects over the question of sinners within the religion of Islam. One sect claimed that all who commit sin, major or minor, are polytheists. This

---

[1] *Cf.* below under Mu'ammarīyah.

[2] Horten, *ibid.*, p. 125. Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 44. Ibn-Khallikān, *ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 642.

[3] Leaders of less important sects, preceding the definite split by the Mu'tazilah.

[4] Horten, *ibid.*, p. 120. Ibn-Khallikān, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 370.

was the view of the Azāriḳah among the Khawārij, who claimed that children of polytheists were polytheists. They therefore sanctioned the killing of the children of those who differed from them, as well as the killing of their women, whether they belonged to the religion of Islam or not.

The Ṣifrīyah among the Khawārij regarded sinners as unbelievers and polytheists, agreeing with the Azāriḳah in this, although they disagreed with them over the killing of the children.

The Najadāt among the Khawārij held that a sinner upon whose condemnation the community had agreed, is an unbeliever and a polytheist, but that the sinner over whom the community has differed should be judged according to the decision of the canonists in this matter. Furthermore, they forgave the sinner so long as he did not know that the sin is forbidden, being in ignorance of this fact, until the testimony is brought against him with respect to it.

The Ibāḍīyah of the Khawārij claimed that the sinner who commits a sin against which he has been warned, knowing of the existence of Allah and what has been revealed from him, is an unbeliever in that he does not recognize the blessings of Allah; but his heresy is not the same as that of the polytheist. Some of the people of this age went so far as to claim that those who commited major sins in this community were atheists, which is worse than being unbelievers who publicly profess their unbelief.

The learned followers of that age held with the rest of
the community, that he within the community who commits
98 a major sin is a believer owing to his knowledge of the
prophets and the books revealed by Allah; and also because
of his knowledge of the fact that all that comes from Allah
is truth. He commits a major sin, however, even though his
error does not deprive him of the attributes of believer and
Islam. To this fifth view conform the companions (of the
Prophet) in the early community and their followers.

When the revolt of the Azāriḳah broke out in al-Baṣrah and al-Ahwāz, and the people came to differ over sinners in the five ways which we have mentioned, Wāṣil ibn-'Aṭā seceded from the views of all of the preceding sects, claiming that the sinner in that community was neither a believer, nor an unbeliever, giving to this error an intermediate rank between the ranks of belief and unbelief. When al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī heard of this heresy of Wāṣil, in which he differed from the sects preceding him, he drove him out of his audience. Wāṣil, therefore, took his stand near one of the columns of the mosque of al-Baṣrah, having as a companion in his error his comrade 'Amr ibn-'Ubaid ibn-Bāb, as a slave bleats for his mother (text not clear). So on that day it was said that these two men had seceded from the accepted view of the community, and they therefore called their followers Mu'tazilah [seceders]. The two then publicly proclaimed their heresy about this intermediate rank of sin. They also added to it an invitation to join with them in the view of the Ḳadarīyah concerning the doctrine of Ma'bad al-Juhanī. It was that occasion which gave rise to the saying that Wāṣil, with his heresy, is a Ḳadarite. Thus the saying: " There is a Ḳadarī in every unbeliever " was originated.

Wāṣil and 'Amr agreed with the Khawārij that he who
commits a major sin should be punished in hell, but they
added that he is nevertheless a believer in the unity of Allah,
and therefore neither a polytheist nor an unbeliever. It is 99
owing to this fact that the Mu'tazilah are not regarded as
fully Khawārij, because the Khawārij, condemning sinners
to eternal punishment, call them unbelievers, and take up
the sword against them, while the Mu'tazilah, although
condemning them to eternal punishment in hell, do not dare
to call them unbelievers, nor to fight the people of any of
their sects, among those whom they fight for differing from

was the view of the Azārikah among the Khawārij, who claimed that children of polytheists were polytheists. They therefore sanctioned the killing of the children of those who differed from them, as well as the killing of their women, whether they belonged to the religion of Islam or not.

The Ṣifrīyah among the Khawārij regarded sinners as unbelievers and polytheists, agreeing with the Azārikah in this, although they disagreed with them over the killing of the children.

The Najadāt among the Khawārij held that a sinner upon whose condemnation the community had agreed, is an unbeliever and a polytheist, but that the sinner over whom the community has differed should be judged according to the decision of the canonists in this matter. Furthermore, they forgave the sinner so long as he did not know that the sin is forbidden, being in ignorance of this fact, until the testimony is brought against him with respect to it.

The Ibāḍīyah of the Khawārij claimed that the sinner who commits a sin against which he has been warned, knowing of the existence of Allah and what has been revealed from him, is an unbeliever in that he does not recognize the blessings of Allah; but his heresy is not the same as that of the polytheist. Some of the people of this age went so far as to claim that those who commited major sins in this community were atheists, which is worse than being unbelievers who publicly profess their unbelief.

The learned followers of that age held with the rest of the community, that he within the community who commits
98 a major sin is a believer owing to his knowledge of the prophets and the books revealed by Allah; and also because of his knowledge of the fact that all that comes from Allah is truth. He commits a major sin, however, even though his error does not deprive him of the attributes of believer and Islam. To this fifth view conform the companions (of the Prophet) in the early community and their followers.

When the revolt of the Azārikah broke out in al-Baṣrah and al-Ahwāz, and the people came to differ over sinners in the five ways which we have mentioned, Wāṣil ibn-'Aṭā seceded from the views of all of the preceding sects, claiming that the sinner in that community was neither a believer, nor an unbeliever, giving to this error an intermediate rank between the ranks of belief and unbelief. When al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī heard of this heresy of Wāṣil, in which he differed from the sects preceding him, he drove him out of his audience. Wāṣil, therefore, took his stand near one of the columns of the mosque of al-Baṣrah, having as a companion in his error his comrade 'Amr ibn-'Ubaid ibn-Bāb, as a slave bleats for his mother (text not clear). So on that day it was said that these two men had seceded from the accepted view of the community, and they therefore called their followers Mu'tazilah [seceders]. The two then publicly proclaimed their heresy about this intermediate rank of sin. They also added to it an invitation to join with them in the view of the Ḳadarīyah concerning the doctrine of Ma'bad al-Juhanī. It was that occasion which gave rise to the saying that Wāṣil, with his heresy, is a Ḳadarite. Thus the saying: " There is a Ḳadarī in every unbeliever " was originated.

Wāṣil and 'Amr agreed with the Khawārij that he who commits a major sin should be punished in hell, but they added that he is nevertheless a believer in the unity of Allah, and therefore neither a polytheist nor an unbeliever. It is 99
owing to this fact that the Mu'tazilah are not regarded as fully Khawārij, because the Khawārij, condemning sinners to eternal punishment, call them unbelievers, and take up the sword against them, while the Mu'tazilah, although condemning them to eternal punishment in hell, do not dare to call them unbelievers, nor to fight the people of any of their sects, among those whom they fight for differing from

them. For this reason, Isḥāḳ ibn-Suwaid al-'Adawī[1] asserted that Wāṣil and 'Amr ibn-'Ubaid belonged to the Khawārij, because they [the Khawārij] agreed regarding the punishment of sinners. Al-'Adawī said in one of his poems:

> "I am free of the Khawārij, nor am I one of them,
> [Free] from al-Ghazzāl among them, and ibn-Bāb
> And from a people who, when they mention 'Alī,
> Return the salute to the clouds."

Then Wāṣil developed three more heresies in which he disagreed with his predecessors. One of these differences was owing to the fact that he found the people of his age differing about 'Alī and his followers and Ṭalḥah and al-Zubair, and 'Ā'ishah and the rest of the *Followers of the Camel.* The Khawārij claimed that Ṭalḥah and al-Zubair, and 'Ā'ishah and their followers in the *Battle of the Camel* proved their disbelief in 'Alī by the very fact that they fought him. Moreover, they claimed that 'Alī was in the right when he fought the *Followers of the Camel,* and the followers of Mu'awiyah at Ṣiffīn, but erred when it came to the matter of the arbitration (by the two judges). The orthodox, however, hold that both sides in the *Battle of the Camel* were true Moslems. They say that 'Alī was on the right side when he fought the others, and that the *Followers of the Camel* were rebellious, and sinned in fighting 'Alī. Their sin, however, cannot be called heresy, nor transgression, for this would render their testimony void, whereas,
100 as a matter of fact, judgment is possible on the testimony of two just witnesses from either side. Wāṣil differed from both of these sects over this matter, claiming that one of the two sides must have been unjust, though not of itself; and that the unjust side could not be ascertained. The others contend that the unjust of the two sides might have been

---

[1] J. A. O. S., vol. xxix, p. 43. Quoted in Mas'ūdī, vol. ii, p. 142.

'Alī and his followers, *i. e.* al-Ḥasan, al-Ḥusain, ibn-'Abbās, 'Ammār ibn-Yāsir, abū-Aiyūb al-Anṣārī and the rest who were with 'Alī at the *Battle of the Camel.* Wāṣil, however, contends that the unjust of the two sides were 'Ā'ishah, Ṭalḥah, al-Zubair, and the rest of the *Followers of the Camel.* To prove this he said: "If 'Alī and Ṭalḥah, or 'Alī and al-Zubair, or a man of the followers of 'Alī and a man of the *Followers of the Camel,* should testify before me over a handful of parsley, I should not decide by the testimony of either of them, because of my knowledge of the fact that one of them is unjust, although not of himself. Likewise I would not decide on the testimony of two who were cursing each other, because of my knowledge of the fact that one of them was unjust, although not of himself. But if two men of one of the sides testified, his testimony would be accepted." And many are the tears shed by the eyes of the outspoken Rāfiḍah over this sinful seceding of the Sheikh al-Mu'tazilah on the question of the just cause of 'Alī and his followers, and the view of Wāṣil about the whole matter. As we have said in one of our poems:

> "A view which is not connected with Wāṣil[1]—May Allah split up
> their unity by this."

And if Allah pleases, we will give the end of this poem later.

2. *Concerning the 'Amrīyah among them.* These are the followers of 'Amr ibn-'Ubaid ibn-Bāb,[2] the freed-man of 101
the banū-Tamīm. His grandfather was one of the captives of Kābul. The innovations and heresies in religion never appeared except from the children of captives, as is mentioned in reports. The things in which 'Amr agreed with Wāṣil were the following: Predestination, the heresy of

---

[1] Play on word *wāṣil* which means connector.

[2] Shahrastānī, *ibid.,* vol. i, p. 47. Horten, *ibid.,* pp. 150-153.

Ḳadar, the wrong view about having an intermediate rank for certain errors, and the rejection of the testimony of two men, one of whom came from the *Followers of the Camel* and the other from the followers of ʿAlī. To these heresies ʿAmr added the following: that both the sides fighting in the *Battle of the Camel* were wrong. Therefore, while Wāṣil rejected the testimony of two men, one of whom was from the *Followers of the Camel,* and the other from the followers of ʿAlī, but accepted the testimony of two men from the *same* side; ʿAmr claimed that such a testimony was to be rejected even if the witnesses came from the *same* side, because he considered both sides to be wrong. After Wāṣil and ʿAmr, the Ḳadarīyah differed over the same point. Al-Naẓẓām [see below], Muʿammar and al-Jāḥiz[1] agreed with Wāṣil about the sides at the *Battle of the Camel.* But Ḥaushab and Hāshim al-Auḳaṣ said that the leaders of the sect are safe, but the followers are condemned to hell.

The Sunnites and the orthodox held that ʿAlī and his followers were in the right in the *Battle of the Camel,* claiming, furthermore, that al-Zubair repented on that day and refrained from fighting. When he reached the Wādi al-Sibāʿ, ʿAmr ibn-Ḥarmūz,[2] taking him by surprise, killed him. ʿAlī gave the murderer the good news that he was going to hell. Ṭalḥah was on the point of returning, when Marwān ibn-al-Ḥakam, who was among the *Followers of the Camel,* shot an arrow at him and killed him.[3] It was ʿĀʾishah who undertook the reconciliation between the two
102 parties. The banū-Azd and the banū-Ḍabbah, however, had the upper hand over her, so that she failed. Whoever calls

---

[1] J. A. O. S., vol. xxix, p. 56. Brockelmann, *loc. cit.*, vol. i, p. 152.

[2] *Cf.* Ṭabarī, Zotenberg, vol. iii, p. 660.

[3] *Ibid.* J. A. O. S., vol. xxix, p. 66.

either both or one of the two sides unbelieving, he, rather than they, is the unbeliever. Such is the view of the sunnites, praise be to Allah for this.

3. *Concerning the Hudhailīyah from among them.* These are the followers of abū-al-Hudhail Muḥammad ibn-al-Hudhail, known as al-ʿAllāf.[1] He was a client of ʿAbd-al-Ḳais, and followed the example of most children of captives, among whom the majority of heresies arose. The rest of the sects of Islam, even including his own followers, the Muʿtazilah, branded him as an unbeliever. The man known among the Muʿtazilah by the name of al-Mirdād wrote a long book called *Concerning the Heresies of abū-al-Hudhail, and Concerning his Peculiar Forms of Unbelief.* Al-Jubbāʾī also wrote a book refuting the belief of abū-al-Hudhail concerning what is created, in which book al-Jubbāʾī condemned him as an unbeliever. Jaʿfar ibn-Ḥarb,[2] well known among the Muʿtazilah, also had a book entitled *Rebuking abū-al-Hudhail.* This book points out the unbelief of abū-al-Hudhail, and also mentions the fact that his views tended toward the views of the Dahrīyah.

Among the heresies of abū-al-Hudhail was his view that the preordination of Allah can cease, at which time Allah would be no longer omnipotent. As a conclusion from this view, he claimed that the bliss of the people of paradise and the torture of the people in hell will cease; the people of paradise and hell remaining in a state of lethargy, unable to do anything. Under these circumstances Allah would not be able to raise a man from the dead, nor to cause the death of a living man, nor would he be able to cause the
stationary to move, nor the thing in motion to be station- 103

---

[1] Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 48 *et seq.* Horten calls him the client of the ʿAbd-al-Ḳais of Baṣrah. (p. 246 *et seq.*) Ibn-Khallikān, *ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 667.

[2] Horten, *ibid.*, p. 251.

ary, nor would he be able to form anything, nor to annihilate anything; and this when people are supposedly sane! His views on this subject are worse than those of the man who believed that paradise and hell would cease, as did Jahm. Jahm, however, although believing that paradise and hell could cease, contended, nevertheless, that after they had ceased, Allah would be able to create their like. This abū-al-Hudhail denied, maintaining that after the cessation of his preordination, his God had no ability to do anything. Among the Mu'tazilah, al-Mirdād attacked abū-al-Hudhail, saying: "According to this, it would follow that if the friend of Allah in paradise happened to be offering a cup to someone in one hand, and a precious gift in the other, when the time of perpetual stillness fell upon all he would forever have to remain in the position of a man being crucified."

Abū-al-Ḥusain al-Khaiyāṭ[1] offered the following two pleas as an apology for abū-al-Hudhail. He claimed first that abū-al-Hudhail meant that when the preordination of Allah had ceased, he would gather together all enjoyment for the people of paradise and they would then remain thus in perpetual rest. Secondly, he claimed that abū-al-Hudhail had maintained these views for the sake of arguing with his opponents over their investigations of his answers. This first plea of abū-al-Ḥusain, in defence of abū-al-Hudhail is, however, false from two points of view. First, he held that two opposite enjoyments can unite in one place at one time, a condition which is as impossible as the union of pleasure and pain in one place. Secondly, if this plea were
104 true, it would necessarily follow that the condition of the people of paradise after Allah's preordination had ceased would be better than their condition when Allah was omnipotent. As regards his claim that abū-al-Hudhail taught the

---

[1] Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 79.

cessation of Allah's preordination only in order to encourage argument, it is refuted by the fact that abū-al-Hudhail wrote down and pointed out this fact in his book called, *Proofs of our Assertions*. Besides, in his book known as *The Book of the Moulds*, he gives a chapter on the refutation of the Dahrīyah, in which he states their views about believers as follows: "If it is possible to have a motion after every motion, and so on to the end; and an occurrence after every occurrence, to the end; then is not the view right which contends that there is no motion unpreceded by a motion, nor an occurrence unpreceded by an occurrence?" He compromised between the two, however, saying: "Just as an occurrence must have a beginning which is not preceded by another occurrence, so there must be an occurrence at the end which is not followed by an occurrence." It is for this reason that he asserted that Allah's ability to preordain ceased. The rest of the theologians of Islam, however, distinguished between the preceding occurrence and the following occurrence by characteristic distinctions which escaped abū-al-Ḥudhail. It was, therefore, because of his ignorance of this that he held his view on the cessation of Allah's preordination. These evident distinctions we have mentioned in the chapter entitled, "Evidences on the fact that the world is created," a chapter which is to be found in our books treating of this subject.

The second of abū-al-Hudhail's heresies is his view that the people of the next world are forced to remain as they are; the people of paradise being forced to eat and drink and intermarry, while the people of hell are forced to [stick 105
to] their views. In the other world, no creature will be allowed to perform a deed, or acquire an opinion. Allah is the creator of their views and their actions, and all else that is ascribed to them. The Ḳadarīyah then blamed Jahm be-

cause of his view that the servants of Allah in this world are forced to do what they do of *themselves*, thus opposing our sect in its view that *Allah* is the creator of that which his servants acquire. They say to our sect: "If he (Allah) is the creator of the oppression of men, then he must be an oppressor, and if he is the creator of the lies of men, then he must be a liar." They might as well say to abū-al-Hudhail: "If you say that Allah, in the next world, creates the falsehood put in the mouth of the people of hell, as they say: 'By Allah, our Lord, we were not polytheists' (Surah 6, v. 23), then he must be a liar, according to the view that the liar is the one who creates the lie." But this conclusion against us does not hold good, because we do not hold that the oppressors are the ones who created the oppression and the liar the lie. On the contrary, we hold that the oppressor is the one from whom oppression proceeds, and the liar the one from whom the lie proceeds, not the one who creates them. Al-Khaīyāṭ offered as a plea for this innovation of abū-al-Hudhail the following: "The next world is a place of rewards and not a place of responsibility; therefore if the people of the other world were the performers of their acts, they would be responsible for them, and their reward 106 and punishment would be in another world." To this view of al-Khaīyāṭ it can be answered: "Do you agree with, or reject, this view of abū-al-Hudhail? If you agree, then you say about it the same thing that he says, which, as a matter of fact differs from what you say. But if you reject it, then there is no meaning to your apology for a thing which you yourself condemn." We, however, say to abū-al-Hudhail: "Why do you say that the condition of the people of the other world is such as to render them unable to perform deeds, and then say that they are commanded to thank Allah for their enjoyment, but not commanded to pray, nor to give alms, nor to fast, nor are they to cease from disobedience; and yet their reward for gratitude and for ceasing from disobedience was to be eternal beatitude for them? And why do you deny that those who are in the next world are to cease from disobedience, and yet are sinless; as we hold, together with most of the Shiites, that the prophets were forbidden sin in this world already, and were sinless; just as the angels were forbidden sin, and were sinless. For this reason Allah says of them: 'They disobey not Allah in what he hath commanded them, but execute his behests'" (Surah 66, v. 6).

The third of his heresies was his view that there are those who are obedient without the intention of pleasing Allah. This is also the view of the Ibāḍīyah among the Khawārij. He claims that there is no Dahrī in the world, nor any unbeliever, who is not obedient to Allah in many things, although disobeying him as far as his unbelief is concerned. The Sunnites and the orthodox, however, say: Obedience to Allah from one who does not know him, is possible only 107 in one case, *i. e.* where there is speculation and deduction, which are necessary before attaining a knowledge of Allah. If a man fulfils this, he becomes obedient (that is, acceptable) to Allah, because Allah has commanded him this. And this is true even if his aim in this act of speculation may not be to draw near to him by means of it. No other obedience to Allah is possible for him, unless its aim be to draw near to him through it, because it is possible for him to draw near to Allah if a knowledge of Allah is attained by this first speculation. Without this contemplation, however, he cannot draw near to Allah, unless by some chance he knew Allah before this speculation and deduction. Abū-al-Hudhail supported this claim, namely that it is possible to obey Allah without knowing him, by saying that the commands of Allah are in opposition to that which he forbids, if, therefore, he who does not know Allah, neglected all his

commands, he must be doing everything which Allah forbids, and in the same manner anyone who has neglected all obedience must be committing all sins. If this were the case a Dahrī would be a Jew, a Christian, a Magian, or an adherent of some other unbelief. If the Magian, however, rejects all his unbeliefs except his Magianism, he would still be disobeying by his *Magianism*, which we know was forbidden him, but he would be obeying Allah in the rejection of the rest of his unbeliefs, because Allah had commanded that they be rejected. Verily I say to him, that the commands of Allah and his prohibitions are not what you think them to
108 be, for there is not a quality of obedience without a quality in opposition to it and to each other; there are no qualities of belief which do not have some qualities opposed to them and at the same time to each other. This is similar to the matter of standing up and sitting down, bending down and lying down. A man may not be sitting, but he would not then necessarily be doing all its opposites; he would not be sitting, however, if he were doing one of its opposites. In like manner, a man is outside of the realm of obedience to Allah by following one line that is opposed to all the lines of obedience, because that kind of unbelief is opposed to another kind of unbelief, just as it is opposed to the rest of the lines of disobedience. All this is self-evident, although abū-al-Hudhail was ignorant of it.

The fourth of his heresies is his view that Allah is not only Allah himself, but his knowledge is himself, and his power is also himself. From this view he must conclude that Allah is knowledge and power. But if he is knowledge and power, it is not possible that he should be knowing and powerful; because knowledge cannot be knowing, and power cannot be powerful. He would be forced to draw the same conclusion if he said that the knowledge of Allah is Allah, and his power is Allah. This amounts to saying that his

knowledge is his power. And if Allah's knowledge is his power, abū-al-Hudhail must conclude that all that is known to him is performed by his power; the Being of Allah, therefore, would be something *performed* by his power, because it is known by him. This is a form of unbelief, and what leads to it is like it.

His fifth heresy was his division of the words of Allah into that which needs an object and that which does not need an object.[1] He claims that the creative word of Allah to things, "Be," is not uttered to an object. The rest of his words, however, had a beginning in some corporeal substance. Yet all his words, according to abū-al-Hudhail, are accidents. Furthermore, he claimed that his creative word to things, "Be," is of the same kind as the word of man, "Be." He thus differentiated between two accidents which 109
were of one kind, the difference [between them] being that one needs an object, while the other is able to do without an object. As to his view of the existence of a decree of Allah without an object, in this view the Baṣrah Mu'tazilah share, adding to it that this word [of Allah] is the same as a decree of ours which needs an object. Consequently, according to him, one of the speakers would be no better than the other.[2] Abū-al-Hudhail has no right to assert that the person saying the word is better in what he says than any other, because he had maintained that, in the other world, Allah creates the words of the people of paradise and the words of the people of hell, but he is not the one who speaks their words. Moreover, his theory of the existence of a word without an object has led him to hold it correct to have

---

[1] *Maḥall* is literally space. In this case it means the place of origin, therefore author or subject. *Cf.* Macdonald, *Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory*, under *mahal.*

[2] Horten, *ibid.*, p. 265. This sentence is ambiguous in the Arabic. Horten translates it very freely. It probably means that where there is no subject there can be no difference.

words without a speaker, which is an impossibility; what leads to it is like it.

His sixth heresy is his view that evidence along the line of reports [of individuals] concerning matters which are not present to the senses, such as the miracles of the prophets, or concerning other matters, cannot be accepted unless there are twenty witnesses, one or more of whom is from the people of paradise (Moslems). Nor would he necessarily accept as evidence the information of unbelievers and impious, even if their number should amount to the number required, for their agreement on a falsehood is inconceivable (*mutawātir*),[2] unless one of them is a man of paradise. He claimed, moreover, that information coming from less than four persons is not to be accepted. Information, however, coming from any number over four up to twenty may be accepted, or may not. The attainment of knowledge, however, from this information is certain if one of the 110 twenty is a man of paradise. This fact about the twenty witnesses he proved by the word of Allah: "Twenty of you who persevere will conquer two hundred idolaters" (Surah 8, v. 66). To fight these two hundred idolaters, however, was not legal unless the twenty were evidence against them. Accordingly the information of one person must be sufficient for proof (that a thing is legal), because in this case one person had to fight ten unbelievers, and the fact that he was permitted to do this was a sign one was enough as evidence against them. ʻAbd-al-Ḳāhir says: what abū-al-Hudhail meant by his statement that twenty were necessary for establishing evidence, if one of them was a person from paradise, is intended for the abolition of the use of the information in the legal canons; because he

---

[1] The *mutawātir* is the report of a people numerically indefinite, whose agreement upon a lie is inconceivable, in view of their large number. *Cf.* Aghnides, *Mohammedan Theories of Finance*, p. 40.

meant that there should necessarily be among them one of the people of paradise who would be, according to his heresy, a Muʻtazilah and a Ḳadarite, and therefore agree with him in his heresy about fate and the cessation of the power of Allah to preordain. He who does not hold this is not, from his point of view, a believer nor of the people of paradise. No one before abū-al-Hudhail held a heresy similar to his heretical view with regard to the necessity of having twenty witnesses.

His seventh heresy was that he differentiated between the acts of the heart and the acts of the organs (of the body), by saying that it is not possible for the acts of the heart to come from their author, if he has no power over them, or is dead. On the other hand, it is possible for the acts of the organs (of the body) to come from their author even after his death, or after the cessation of his power, in case he is living. He went on to say that the dead and the incapacitated can be the authors of the acts of the organs, through 111 the power which existed before death or incapacitation. But al-Jubbā'ī and his son abū-Hāshim claim that the acts of the heart are in this case like the acts of the organs (of the body), in that it is possible for them to occur when the author is incapacitated, and even after the power to produce the act has ceased. Thus the view of al-Jubbā'ī and his son on this matter is worse than that of abū-al-Hudhail. Abū-al-Hudhail, however, was ahead of him in holding that it was possible for both the dead and the incapacitated to be authors of the acts of the organs. In this heresy, al-Jubbā'ī and his son followed abū-al-Hudhail's example; they went further, however, and concluded that it was possible for an incapacitated man to be the author of the acts of the heart. The founder of a heresy, however, is responsible for its sinfulness, and the sinfulness of those who follow it, up till the day of judgment, with no decrease in the sinfulness of those who choose to follow it.

His eighth heresy was as follows: When he discovered that men differed over the question as to whether knowledge is natural or acquired, he rejected both of these views, as well as the view that what is known through the senses and through intuition is natural knowledge, while what is known through induction is acquired knowledge. He then set up for himself a view that differed from all those of his predecessors, saying that knowledge is of two kinds, the one is compulsory knowledge, such as the knowledge of Allah, and knowledge of the evidence leading to a knowledge of him; the second is elective and acquired, such as knowledge of an event gained through the sense, or through syllogisms. From this he drew his view of the belated character of knowledge, in which he differed from the rest of the
112 believers. According to this view, he said that the child in the second stage of his knowledge of himself does not have to bring all his knowledge of unity and justice together without a break, but he must bring with the knowledge of the unity and justice of Allah the knowledge of all that Allah has commanded him to do. The result is that if he does not fulfil the requirement of this second stage of his knowledge of himself, and happens to die in the third stage, he dies an infidel and an enemy to Allah, worthy of eternal fire. As to the knowledge with regard to information which can be known only through hearing, such knowledge should be attained by the child in the second stage of hearing, which constitutes a good excuse for him. Bishr ibn-Mu'tamar,[1] however, said that it was in the third stage that the child must show his mental knowledge, when in the third stage of his knowledge of himself, because the second stage is a stage of speculation and of thought, so that if he does not fulfil this in the third stage, and happens to die in the fourth

---

[1] Horten, *ibid.*, p. 161. Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 65.

stage, he will then be an enemy of Allah, worthy of eternal fire. Thus there are a few fatalists (Ḳadarites) who denied the view of the Azāriḳah that the children of their opponents were condemned to hell, and denied also the view of those who held that the children of unbelievers are condemned to hell; these same men claimed that the children of believers who died in the third or fourth stage of their knowledge of themselves, were condemned to eternal fire, although they had committed no unblief.

His ninth heresy lay in the fact that he contended that it is possible for a body having parts to have its motion confined to certain of its parts. In the case of color, he held 113
that this was not possible. The rest of the philosophers said that it is only the part in which motion arises that is the thing moving, and that the motion does not apply to the combination of all parts, just as the part which is black, is the black part; blackness not extending to the combination of all the parts. If, however, the combination of all the parts moves, there is motion in every part, just as if the whole is black, every part is black.

His tenth heresy is his view that the part of a body which cannot be divided, cannot have a color of itself, when it is alone, nor can it be seen when there is no color in it. This forces the conclusion that if Allah created the part by itself, he could not see it. Praise be to Allah who has preserved the Sunnites from the heresies which we have given in this chapter on abū-al-Hudhail.

4. *Concerning the Naẓẓāmīyah.* These are the followers of abū-Isḥāḳ Ibrāhīm ibn-Saiyār, called al-Naẓẓām.[1] The Mu'tazilah try to deceive the common people when they assert that he was called al-Naẓẓām because he composed

---

[1] J. A. O. S., vol. xxix, p. 58. Horten, *ibid.*, p. 189. Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 53. Macdonald, *ibid.*, pp. 140, 141, 152.

prose and well-measured poetry. As a matter of fact, he composed only beads in the market of al-Baṣrah, and it was because of this that he was called al-Naẓẓam.[1] During his youth he mingled with the sect of the Dualists and the Sophists (Sumanīyah), who assert that all proofs are equal. He later fell in with the heretic philosophers, after which he associated with Hishām ibn-al-Ḥakam al-Rāfiḍī. From Hishām and the heretic philosophers he took the view on the non-existence of the atom that is indivisible. From this he drew his view of the *leap* which no one before had thought of. From the dualists he took his view that he 114 who performs justice can neither oppress nor lie. He further took from Hishām ibn-al-Ḥakam that colors, taste, smell and sound are bodies. It was from this heresy that he drew the conclusion that bodies penetrate each other in the same space. He agreed,[2] moreover, with the dualists, with the innovators among philosophers, and with the quasi-heathen in Islām. He also admired the view of the Brahmans who disbelieved in prophecies. He did not, however, venture to profess this view, fearing the sword. Furthermore, he denied the miraculous nature of the Koran as regards its composition, and he also denied the miracles which are reported of our Prophet—for example, "the splitting of the moon; that stones in his hand had praised Allah; that water had sprung forth between his fingers"—so that denying the miracles of our Prophet he almost came to deny his prophecy. Moreover, he found the fulfilment of the regulations of Islamic law unbearable. He did not, however, dare to profess its abolition, although he denied evidences leading to it. It was on this ground that he denied "the evidence of the agreement of the community and the evidence of analogy," in developing the derivative institutes of the law. He also rejected proof drawn from witnesses whose evidence is not accepted, as well as the claim that knowledge is natural. He himself taught that the Companions had agreed in developing these institutes, and he reminded the people of what he had read in the pages written by his opponents. He criticized the juridical decisions of the Companions, however, and of all of the sects of Islām, which had split over doctrine or tradition, including the Khawārij and the Shīʻites and the Najjārīyah. Most of the Muʻtazilah united in condemning al-Naẓẓām. Of the Ḳadarīyah, only a few followed him in his errors, *e. g.* al-Aswārī 115 and ibn-Ḥāyit, Faḍl al-Ḥadathī and al-Jāhiẓ; each one of them differing with him on some of his errors, and adding to others. The admiration of this minority which followed him was like the admiration of the scarab beetle when rolling its ball (of dung). Most of the sheikhs of the Muʻtazilah agreed that he was a heretic, including abū-al-Hudhail, who called him a heretic in his book entitled *An Answer to al-Naẓẓam*, also in his book directed against him on *Accidents, Man and Indivisible Atoms*. The view for which al-Jubbāʼī condemned him, was the one which held that the deeds of Allah are brought forth by the affirmation of (their) creation. In this case it is al-Jubbāʼī who is the heretic, and no one else. We would like to mention a few of some of the heresies of the Muʻtazilah.

Al-Jubbāʼī also condemned al-Naẓẓam for rejecting that Allah could be tyrannical, as well as for his view about the four humours of the body. It was on this last subject that he wrote a book against him and against Muʻammar.

Among the Muʻtazilah there was also al-Iskāfī who wrote a book against al-Naẓẓām in which he condemned him for most of his doctrines. Jaʻfar ibn-Ḥarb also wrote a book concerning al-Naẓẓam's heresy in that he denied the indivisible atom. As to the books written in condemnation of him by the Sunnites and the orthodox, Allah alone can count them. Our sheikh abū-l-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī wrote three books on the heresies of al-Naẓẓām. Al-Ḳalānisī[1] also wrote books and dissertations against him. The Ḳāḍī abū-Bakr Muḥammad ibn-abī-al-Ṭaiyib al-Ash‘arī wrote a big book on some of the fundamental doctrines of al-Naẓẓām. He has pointed out his errors in the book on the heresies of the expositors. In this book of ours we shall mention the most famous of al-Naẓẓām's heresies.

---

[1] *Naẓẓām* means a composer.

[2] Text uncertain, *wadalīn*? Horten, *ibid.*, p. 170.

First of all we will take up his theory that Allah has not 116 the power to do to his worshippers that which is not to their good. Nor does he consider Allah capable of taking away a jot from the enjoyment of the people of paradise, because their enjoyment is their just share, and the lessening of this share would therefore be injustice. Nor can Allah increase the torment of those in hell a jot, nor take a jot away from it. He also claims that Allah has not the power to remove anyone from paradise, or to throw into hell anyone who does not belong to the people of hell. According to this view, he said that if a child stood at the edge of hell, Allah would have no power to throw him in, but the child could throw himself in, and the Zabānīyah[2] can throw him in. To this he added that Allah could not blind a person who has sight, nor give a disease to a healthy one, nor impoverish a rich person, if he knows that sight and health and wealth are for their good. In the same way he cannot enrich a poor person, nor heal a sick one, if he knows that disease and sickness and poverty are for their good. To this he then added the view that Allah could not create a snake or a scorpion, or a body of

---

[1] An opponent of al-Ash‘arī who died in 870. Horten, *ibid.*, p. 375.

[2] Certain angels, the tormentors of the damned in hell; so-called because of their thrusting the people of the fire thereinto. The angels mentioned in the Koran Surah 66, v. 6.

any kind, if he knows that the creation of something else would be better than their creation. The Baṣrīyah among the Mu‘tazilah condemned this view and said that he who has power over justice must have power over injustice, and he who has power over truth must have power over falsehood, though he may not commit oppression, nor lie, because of the hideous nature of these acts or because he realizes his ability to do without them, because ability to do a thing necessitates also the ability to do the opposite. Now, if al-Naẓẓām held that Allah had no power over injustice and falsehood, he would be forced to say that he had no 117 power over truth and justice either. Such a view as the latter is heresy, bringing in its train other heresies as bad. They also say that there is no difference between al-Naẓẓām's view that Allah had no power to hinder nor to cause to act, and the view claiming that he is forced to perform deeds without his own choice. This also is a heresy, bringing in its train other heresies as bad. One of the remarkable acts of al-Naẓẓām in this connection is that he wrote a book on Dualism and in it expressed his surprise at the view of the Manicheans, that light orders its different kinds which are to be found in darkness to do good, although darkness can do only evil and can predicate naught but evil deeds. Al-Naẓẓām expressed his surprise that the Dualists blame darkness for doing evil when they claim that it has no power to do good, but can do evil only. One might say to him, " If, according to you, Allah is to be praised for performing justice and truth, and has not the power to perform injustice and falsehood, why then do you deny the view of the Dualists in blaming darkness for doing evil, even though it can do nothing else?"

His second heresy was his view that man is a soul, which, in the form of a rarified body enters the compact body. This was in addition to his other view that this soul is life

in union with the body. He claimed further that in the body it became a compact union, and therefore one substance without difference or opposition. From this view results the heresy that it is not man who can be seen, but the body in which he is. This would force the conclusion
118 that the Companions did not see the Prophet of Allah, but saw only the mould in which the Prophet was. According to this no one sees his father and his mother, but only their moulds. Furthermore, if he says of man that he is not an external body, but only a soul within a body, he must then say the same of the ass, that he too is not his body and is only a soul in his body, and that he is the life in union with the body. This would be true also of the horse and the rest of the four-footed animals, and all the birds and reptiles and the rest of animal kind. It would apply also to angels and jinn, man and devils. It would, therefore, follow that no one ever sees an ass or a horse or a bird, or any kind of animal. Furthermore, the Prophet did not see an angel, nor do the angels see each other. In fact, anyone looking must see only the moulds of the things which we have enumerated. Still further, when he says that the soul in the body is the man, and that it is the doer rather than the body which is its mould, he must then conclude that it is the soul which is the adulterer or the thief or the murderer. Accordingly, if the body is lashed, or the hand cut off, the amputated member is not after all the real thief, nor the body lashed the real adulterer . . . this is sufficient; for Allah has said: "The whore and the whore-monger . . . scourge each one of them with an hundred stripes" (Surah 24, v. 2). And he has also said: "As to the thief, whether man or woman, cut ye off their hands in recompense for their doings" (Surah 5, v. 42). This is sufficient proof from the Koran of his error.

119 His third heresy was his view that the soul which is man.

has the power (to act) of itself, lives through itself, and becomes incapacitated because of a calamity which befalls it, this incapacity itself being a body. This view forces him to say that the incapacitated and the dead are the soul of the man who is living and able, or else that the incapacitated dead is the man's body. If he says that man is the thing which becomes incapacitated and dies, he must give up his view that man lives by himself, and has the power to act of himself; for in that case his soul exists even in the case of his death, while he himself is dead or incapacitated. If, on the other hand, he claims that it is the soul which has strength of itself, and that it is the body that dies and becomes incapacitated, then it must be different from that which lives and has power. From this it follows that Allah has no power to resuscitate the dead, nor cause the living to die, nor to give power to an incapacitated person, nor to incapacitate an able one. For the living cannot die, nor the strong become incapacitated. But Allah has attributed to himself the ability to resuscitate the dead. If al-Naẓẓām claims that the soul lives and has power of itself, and dies and becomes incapacitated only because harm comes to it, then he does not differ from those who claim that the soul is dead and becomes incapacitated of itself, and lives and has strength only through the life and strength that enter into it.

His fourth heresy is the view that the soul is of one kind, and its deeds of another kind; that bodies are of two kinds, living and dead; and that it is impossible for the living body to die, or for the dead to become alive. This view he took from the Burhānite Dualists, who claim that light is an imponderable living body whose property is to be always 120
ascending, and that darkness is a heavy dead body whose property is to be always descending, and that the heavy dead body is unable to become light [as opposed to heavy],

and the light living body is unable to become a heavy dead body.

In his fifth heresy he contended that all animals were of one species, because they all agree in having the same perceptive powers. Thus he claimed that when acts agree, it is a proof that what caused them are in agreement. He claimed also that two different things would not come from one and the same species; just as fire does not give out both heat and cold, nor snow give out both heat and cold. This in truth is the view of the Dualists, that light does good and not harm, and darkness does evil and no good comes from it; because one author cannot perform two different acts, just as heat and cold do not both come forth from fire, nor from snow. The strange thing is that he compiled a book against the Dualists in which he pointed out to them the impossibility of mingling light and darkness if they belong to different species and actions and had movements in different directions. In spite of this view, he claimed that light and heavy bodies (soul and body), though different in species and in the direction of their motion, penetrate each other in the same space. But the penetration which he asserts is worse than mingling, which the Dualists hold, and which he disputed.

His sixth heresy is his view that it is the nature of fire to surmount everything. If, therefore, it is released from the 121 filth that holds it in this world, it rises until it goes beyond heaven and the Throne, unless some other of its species unites with it, in which case it does not rise. Of the soul he said the same thing, that when it is separated from the body, it rises, and a change takes place in it. This is similar to the view of the Dualists that the parts of light which mingle with the parts of darkness, when they separate from the latter, rise to the world of light, and when the light becomes permanent above the heavens, the souls unite with it.

He is, therefore, a Dualist. If he affirms the existence of fire above the atmosphere, with which the rising fires in the atmosphere combine, he is one of the Naturalists, who claim that air in rising, is at a distance from the earth of sixteen miles, above which is fire which reaches the sphere of the moon, and with which the rising flames of fire unite. Al-Naẓẓām is therefore either a Dualist or a Naturalist, concealing himself among the mass of the Moslems.

His seventh heresy is his view that the actions of animals are all of one species, and are composed of motion and quiescence. Quiescence, according to him, is limited motion. Moreover, he considers knowledge and will motion, and hence accidentals. All accidentals, according to him, are of one species — all motion. As to color, taste, sound, and senses, these, according to him, are different permeating material things. The result of this view of his, that the acts of animals are of one species, is necessarily that belief is like unbelief and knowledge like ignorance, and love like hatred. Furthermore, it follows that the acts of the prophet toward believers are like the acts of Satan toward unbelievers, and that the invitation of the prophet to the people to 122 join the religion of Allah is like the invitation of Satan to go astray. In some of the books he has gone so far as to say that all these acts are of one species, differing only in their name, because of the differences of their order, they being of one species because they are all acts of animals. According to him, one animal cannot perform two different acts, just as fire can not make cold and hot. According to this, al-Naẓẓām cannot get angry with anyone who scolds or courses him, because the sentiment of the author who said, "May Allah curse al-Naẓẓām," according to al-Naẓẓām, is just the same as if he had said, "May Allah bless al-Naẓẓām." Furthermore, a child born of adultery is the same as a legal child. If he himself is satisfied with such a doctrine he is worthy of it, and of the views that necessarily follow.

His eighth heresy is the view that color, taste, smell, sound and sense are bodies, and that many bodies can permeate one and the same space. He refuses the view of Hishām ibn-al-Ḥakam that knowledge and will and motion are bodies, saying that if these three were objects they could not unite in one thing, nor in one body. And yet he holds that color, taste and sound are bodies permeating each other in the same space; in answering his opponent he confutes himself. He who maintains that bodies permeate each other in the same space must admit the possibility of a camel passing through the eye of a needle!

123 His ninth heresy is his view concerning sound. He claims that there are not two men on the earth who have heard the same sound, except in the sense that it (the sound) is of the same species of sounds, just as two men eat one species of food, even if that which one of them eats is not what the other eats. This view developed from his claim that a sound is heard only as it follows into the spirit on the path of hearing. It is not possible, however, to flow from the same object into two different organs of hearing. He compared this with water which is sprinkled on a crowd of people, each one being sprinkled with different water. According to this assumption it must necessarily follow that no one has heard the same word from Allah, nor from his prophet, because what each one of all the hearers hears is a *part* of the sound of the word of the speaker. The word as a *whole* may perhaps consist of two letters, so that according to him one of them is not the word. If he then claims that the sound is not a word nor is it heard except when it consists of several letters, it follows that a group of people cannot hear just one letter, for one letter cannot divide itself into several letters according to the number of hearers!

His tenth heresy is his view concerning the divisibility of every particle *ad infinitum.* This idea implies the absurd

view that Allah does not include the whole of the world by knowing about it, yet the following is the word of Allah: "And taketh count of all things by number" (Surah 72, v. 28). One of his peculiarities is that he denies the view of the Manicheans to the effect that Ahriman, who is the spirit of darkness, passed through the abodes of darkness, 124 carrying out the worst possible evil until he saw light. In connection with this al-Naẓẓām said to them: "If the abodes of darkness stretch downward without limit, then how can Ahriman pass through them? For to pass through what has no end is impossible." Although denying this, he nevertheless claimed that when the soul separated from the body, it passed through the upper world, in spite of the fact that he maintained that the space in the upper worlds through which the spirit passes is infinite in its parts, while each part in its turn is infinite in its part. If this is the case, how can the spirit traverse them in limited time? It was to make this possible that he adopted the doctrine of the *leap*, a doctrine which had never been held by any philosophers before him. Stranger than that, he drew from the Dualists the conclusion that light and darkness are finite in everyone of the six directions. What led him to this way of thinking was that they held that both light and darkness were finite in the direction in which they met. According to this, was he trying to show that everybody has finite parts in the center because it is finite on all sides? If, however, the finiteness of the body in its six directions does not incur finiteness in its center (according to him), he is then not disagreeing with the Dualists in their view that all light and darkness are finite on the side at which they meet. One must not, however, conclude that they are finite on all other sides.

Al-Naẓẓām's eleventh heresy is the doctrine of the *leap*. He says that a body which is in a given place, may pass from

125 that place to a third place or a tenth without necessarily traversing the places which separate the first and the tenth, nor by being annihilated in the first to be resuscitated in the tenth. If al-Naẓẓām is just, we will refer this case to him to declare its fallacy, although we believe that after the (famous) arbitration of abū-Mūsa al-'Ash'arī and 'Amr ibn-al-Aṣī any arbitration is nonsense.

His twelfth heresy was so horrible that the heavens were almost rent asunder by it. It is the view that no information about Allah, or his prophet, or his worshippers, can be accepted as true. Furthermore, that bodies and colors can not be known simply by information about them. What drove him to this accursed view was his other belief that there are two kinds of known things, that which is perceptible and that which is not perceptible. The perceptible are bodies about which knowledge can be acquired only through the senses. According to him, the senses can perceive only that which is body; color, taste, smell and sound being, according to him, bodies. It is because of this that they are reached by the senses. As to the imperceptible, it also is of two kinds, the eternal and the accidental. The~~y~~ way to know the two is not through information, but only through syllogism and intuition, and therefore neither through the senses nor information. He was asked in this connection how he knew that Muḥammad, as well as the rest of the prophets and the kings, were on the earth, since nothing can be known through information. His answer was that those who actually saw the prophet, in the act of seeing him took from him a particle which they divided among themselves, and united with their souls. When later they reported his existence to their descendants, some of this particle left them and joined the souls of the descendants. The descendants, therefore, know the prophet because a particle from the prophet has
126 joined with their soul. This continues as each report is

passed on to the succeeding generation down to our own time. The objection made to this was that Jews, Christians, Magians and heretics know that our prophet was on earth. Does al-Naẓẓām then think that a particle has passed from him into the spirit of the unbelievers? This is a necessary conclusion. He claimed, furthermore, that when the people of paradise have intercourse with the people of hell, and the people of hell see them, and the two converse with each other, particles of each become exchanged. In this way particles of the bodies and spirits of the people of hell enter paradise, while particles of the bodies and spirits of the people of paradise enter hell. And there is enough shame on him for having dealt with this heresy.

Al-Naẓẓām's thirteenth heresy is reported by al-Jāḥiẓ, and is to the effect that forms and bodies renew themselves as they pass from one condition to another, and moreover that Allah creates this world and that which is in it without first annihilating it and then resuscitating it. Abū-al-Ḥusain al-Khaiyāṭ says in his book against abū-al-Ruwandī that al-Jāḥiẓ made a mistake in his report about this view of al-Naẓẓām. Now it might be said to al-Khaiyāṭ, "If al-Jāḥiẓ were right in his report, you should accept it as a sign of al-Naẓẓām's foolishness and mental aberration; but if he lied about him, then you should accept it as a sign of the shamelessness of al-Jāḥiẓ and his idiocy." And this was the sheikh of the Mu'tazilah and their philosopher! Since the Mu'tazilah lied about their Lord and their Prophet, we cannot deny that they lied about their ancestors.

His fourteenth heresy is his view that Allah created man 127
and four-footed beasts and the rest of the animals, and all kinds of plants, and the forms of minerals all at once; and that he did not create Adam before creating his children, nor did he create the mothers before creating their children. He claimed that Allah created all these at one time, but that

certain things are more numerous than others. So that the question of priority and sequence is merely one of appearance and place. By this view he condemns as a lie everything that has been agreed upon by the ancestors of the Believers, as well as the people of the Book, whether Jews, Christians or Samaritans. The view of all these being that Allah created the tablet and the pen before the creation of the heavens and the earth. As to the Moslems, the only thing over which they differ is whether heaven or the earth was created first. Al-Naẓẓām differs from the Moslems and the people of the Book, as well as from most of the Mu'tazilah, because the Baṣrah Mu'tazilah claimed that Allah created his will before creating the thing willed; while the rest of them assert that some bodies in the world were created before others. Abū-al-Hudhail claimed that he created his word to the thing "but not in a place" before he created bodies and accidents. Al-Naẓẓām's view about what is manifest in bodies and what is hidden, as well as their permeation, is worse than the view of the Zahirīyah who claimed that all accidents are hidden in bodies. The characteristics of the bodies, however, are ascribed to them by the manifestation of certain accidents, and the hiding of
128 others. In both doctrines, there is a turning away from the Duhrīyah (Dahrite?) view to the denial of the finite character of bodies and accidents; for they assert that all these exist in every condition, provided some are hidden and others manifest, although nothing may have appeared in the condition of manifestation. All this is heresy and unbelief; and in fact everything that leads to error is like it.

His fifteenth heresy is that the composition of the Koran, and the beauty of the literary arrangement of its words, do not show the miraculous character of its Prophet; nor are they a proof of the reliability of his claim to prophecy. The basis for the proof of his reliability lies only in what the

Koran contains regarding the manifestation of unknown things. As to the composition of the Koran, and the beauty of the literary arrangements of its verses, verily the worshippers are capable of the same, and even of what is more beautiful than this, in composition and literary arrangement. But this view is in opposition to the words of Allah: "Were men and jinn assembled to produce the like of this Koran, they could not produce its like, though the one should help the other" (Surah 17, v. 90). In denying the miraculous character of the Koran, he is denying the prophecy of the man who defied the Arabs to produce anything like it.

His sixteenth heresy is his view that a report may be a lie, even though the number of the transmitters may surpass the prescribed limits, and even though the aims of those who transmit it and their motives may differ. He asserts this, together with the view, that a report may, on the other hand, be true, even though only a few may have handed it
down. Our followers have condemned him, as well as 129
those of the Mu'tazilah who agree with him in this doctrine which he adopted.

His seventeenth heresy is as follows: the agreement of the Moslem community of each century, as well as that of all centuries combined (as regards opinion and inference) may be an error. From this fact he was bound to conclude that nothing upon which the community have agreed can be trusted, because, according to him, there is always a possibility of their agreeing on an error. Since some of the regulations of the law have been taken by Moslems from reports that had been handed down, others from single reports, others from things upon which the community had agreed, deducing them by analogy and inference; and since al-Naẓẓām disbelieves in the evidence drawn from what has been handed down, as well as from agreement and analogy, and also rejects a single report, unless the knowledge it gives is unmistakable, he is putting himself in a position to reject the divine regulations of the law, by rejecting its methods.

His eighteenth heresy comes under the head of threats. He claims that the man who takes by force, or steals one hundred and ninety-nine dirhams only, did not commit a crime. In fact, he is not to blame, until what he has taken by force or stolen, and about which he has acted treacherously, amounts to two hundred dirhams and over. If he has based this view on the amount of a theft for which the penalty is the amputation of the hand, he is wrong, for there is no one who would limit that punishment to two hundred dirhams. On the contrary, such a punishment is considered by most people to be necessary for the theft of even a quarter of a dīnār, or its value. With this view al-Shāfi'i and his followers agree. Mālik said it should be inflicted for a quarter of a dīnār or three dirhams. Abū-Ḥanīfah said amputation should be inflicted for ten dirhams and more, while others said it should be inflicted for forty dirhams, or their value. 130 The Ibāḍiyah considered amputation necessary for small as well as big thefts, no one limiting the punishment to two hundred dirhams. If the fact of guilt, deserving of amputation, is authenticated by the thief himself, even the robbery of thousands of dinars will not be a transgression, because amputation is not inflicted on one who takes by force, and then confesses. It follows, moreover, that he who steals the thousands that are not guarded or that belong to his own son, is not guilty, because no decision is to be found about these two cases [the case of one who confesses, and one who steals unguarded thousands]. If, however, al-Naẓẓām has based his limitation of the punishment to two hundred on the fact that the two hundred is the amount given for alms, he must then condemn the man who steals forty sheep, the number necessary for the offering to be

considered alms, even if its value was below two hundred dirhams. If analogy has no place in this definition of his and there is no reference to it in the Koran, or the true tradition, then his definition comes only as the whisper of Satan who invites him to error.

His nineteenth heresy is his view that faith is the avoiding of major sins. The result of this view was that he regarded words and deeds as in no way faith. Furthermore, prayer, as regards its performance, is neither faith nor drawn from faith; for faith is the forsaking of major sins. At the same time he held that both the acts and their forsaking are virtue. As to this, men before him were divided, some saying that all prayer was faith, and others that nothing in prayer was faith. Al-Naẓẓām differed from both of these groups, however, claiming that whereas prayer is not faith, the forsaking of major sins is.

His twentieth heresy comes under the head of the future 131 life. It was his view that scorpions, snakes, beetles, bees, flies, scarabs, dogs and swine, as well as the rest of the animals and insects, enter heaven. He claimed also that everyone and everything that Allah judges worthy of heaven is not necessarily of a different grade of precedence. Accordingly he claimed that Abraham the son of the prophet of Allah could not in heaven have precedence over the children of the faithful. Nor do the children of the faithful in heaven differ in degree, pleasure or grade from the snakes, scorpions and beetles, because there is no work for the latter just as there is no work for the former. Thus he limits the Lord of the worlds from making a difference for the children of the prophets, by giving them more pleasure than he bestows on the insects. Al-Naẓẓām did not even stop here, but went on to say that the Lord of the worlds did not even have the power to do this. Moreover, he claimed that Allah bestowed on the prophets only that which he bestowed on the animals, because, according to his view of precedence, there is no difference made between those who are wise and those who are not, for these differ only as to reward and punishment, according to the worth of their works. Holding such a view as this, al-Naẓẓām cannot get angry at any one who says to him: " May Allah resuscitate you with dogs and swine and snakes and scorpions in their quarters." And our wish for him is that he may remain in the condition to which this prayer consigns him.

His twenty-first heresy appeared when he brought forward his view about mental sciences. He introduced these 132 same errors, which had never been heard of before, into the dominion of religious law. His view was that divorce enforced by any of the following formulæ was not legal; *e. g.* the word of the husband to his wife: " Thou art free, or liberated, or thou art free to go thy way, or follow thy people, or depart," or any other divorce formulæ accepted by the Canonists, whether he intends divorce or not. The Canonists agree that such formulæ constitute a divorce, provided there is intention of divorce. The lawyers of al-'Irāḳ hold that even if used only in anger, the formula for divorce is equivalent to the declaration of divorce even if no intention is present.

Another of al-Naẓẓām's errors is about separation, for he says that to have a husband say, " You are to me like the back of my mother," means divorce; whereas if he uses the word belly or generative organs, instead of back, it is not a divorce. This differs entirely from the customary view of the community. He also condemned abū-Mūsa al-Ash'arī for his decision.

Furthermore, al-Naẓẓām brought forward his view that sleep does not destroy the purity of ablutions, unless there is excrement. This is contrary to the view of the majority of the leaders, who believed that sleep lying flat destroys

purification, and who differ only about sleep taken in a sitting, kneeling, or bent position. Abū-Ḥanīfah held that it is permissible, while most of the followers of al-Shāfi'ī denied it by the process of analogy.

Another of his errors was that he claimed that he who intentionally neglects a prescribed prayer, will receive no merit for fulfilling it, nor is its fulfilment obligatory for him. To the rest of the community, this was a heresy similar to the one which claimed that the five prayers are not prescribed. Some of the religious lawyers of the community say that if a man neglects a prescribed prayer, he must perform the prayers of one night and one day. Sa'īd ibn-al-Musaiyab said: " He who forsakes a prescribed 133 prayer so that the time for it is passed, must perform a thousand prayers (to make up)." The place of prayer has been so dignified by some religious lawyers, *e. g.* Aḥmad ibn-Ḥanbal, that they condemn as an infidel any man who forsakes it intentionally, though he may not consider its negligence lawful. Al-Shāfi'ī held that a man who neglected prayer intentionally should be executed; although he did not condemn as a heretic the man who neglected it out of laziness but not if he considered it illegal. Abū-Ḥanīfah, on the other hand, decreed imprisonment for the neglect of prayer, accompanied by torture, until the man prayed. Al-Naẓẓām's disagreement with the community over the obligation of performing neglected prescribed prayers, is similar to the disagreement of the infidels (zanādiḳah) over the obligation of any prayer. Both disagreements are not to have consideration.

In addition to the heresies which we have recounted, al-Naẓẓām has attacked the reports of the Companions and the Disciples because of their interpretation of the Koran. Al-Jāḥiẓ alluded to him in his work entitled Knowledge (*al-Ma'ārif*), and in his book known as Opinion (*Futya*), saying that he blamed the traditionalists because they handed down traditions of abū-Hurairah.[1] He claimed that abū-Hurairah was the worst of liars, and he attacked 'Umar al-Fārūḳ.[2] In fact, he claimed that Fārūḳ was in doubt about his own faith at the battle of al-Hudaibīyah as well as on the day of the death of the Prophet. He was also with those who were angry with the Prophet on the night of the 'Akabah,[3] and he struck Fāṭimah and . . . (not clear in text). Furthermore, he criticized 'Umar for sending Naṣr ibn-al-Ḥajjāj from al-Madīnah to al-Baṣrah. And he claimed that 'Umar introduced genuflections in prayer, and forbade temporary marriage [*mut'ah*] during pilgrimage, and the marriage of a freedman to an Arab woman. He blamed 'Uthmān for sending al-Ḥakam ibn-al-'Āṣi[4] to al-Madīnah and for making al-Walīd ibn-'Uḳbah[5] his governor over al-Kūfah. Al-Walīd was the man who led the prayer when he was drunk.

134 He also blamed 'Uthmān for helping Sa'īd ibn-al-'Āṣi with forty thousand dirhams for his marriage contract. Moreover, he accused him of claiming for himself the possession of the land belonging to the Moslem community (*ḥima*).

He then mentioned 'Alī, claiming that when asked about a cow that had killed a donkey, he said: "I judge this according to my opinion." In this he expressed his ignorance, for who is he that he should judge according to his opinion?

---

[1] Ṭabarī ed. Zotenberg, vol. iii, pp. 466, 703 *et seq.*

[2] By-name given to 'Umar the caliph.

[3] *'Aḳabah.* Ibn-Hishām, *Biography*, p. 288. The night on which allegiance was sworn to the Prophet. Margoliouth, *Mohammed*, pp. 202, 204.

[4] Mistake in Baghdādī. Instead of Ḥakam ibn-al-'Āsi, it should be al-Ḥakam ibn-abi-al-'Āsī. *Cf.* Ibn-Ḥajar, vol. i, p. 709 where this very incident is mentioned.

[5] Ibn-Ḥajar, vol. iii, p. 1312. Ṭabarī, *ibid.*, vol. iii, p. 566.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 566 *et seq.*

He also attacked abū-Mas'ūd[1] for his view about the tradition which relates to the marriage of the daughter of *Wāshtif.*[2] [For he claimed] "I judge according to my own opinion, and if it is a correct judgment, then it is from Allah, but if it is a mistaken one, then it is from me." In addition he contended that abū-Mas'ūd was lying when he stated that the Prophet had said: "He is happy who rejoices in the womb of his mother, and he is unhappy who is unhappy in the womb of his mother." Al-Naẓẓām also considered him a liar in his report of the "splitting of the moon," and in his report about the Jinns of the "night of the Jinn." Such was the view of al-Naẓẓām with regard to the report of the Companions and of the people of the abode of paradise, of whom Allah said: "Well pleased now hath God been with the believers when they plighted fealty to thee under the tree" (Surah 48, v. 18). He who gets angry with those whom Allah blesses, he incurs anger rather than they. He then said in his book that those of the Companions who believed in analogy either are of opinion that this is legal for them and ignore that it is forbidden to judge by analogy according to decisions directed against them, or else wish to be remembered as disagreeing, and thus be leaders of sects. Because of this [latter difficulty] they chose to accept analogy [as legal]. Al-Naẓẓām thus attributed to them the preference of desire to religion. [For they deliberately chose the view that cast the least reflection on them.] The only crime of the followers, then, according to this hideous infidel, is that they were unitarians, who did not hold the heresy of the Ḳadarīyah who reckoned numerous 135

---

[1] Nawāwī, p. 757, under 'Uḳbah ibn-'Amr. Ṭabarī, *ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 439; vol. iii, p. 36.

[2] None of the more important historians mention this man.

other creators with Allah. He rejects the tradition of abū-Mas'ūd, that he is happy who is happy in his mother's womb, and he is unhappy who is unhappy in his mother's womb, only because this differs from the view of the Ḳadarīyah who assert that neither happiness nor misery come from the decree of Allah or through his predestination. Al-Naẓẓām's denial of the "splitting of the moon" is due to his unwillingness to ascribe any miracle to our Prophet, just as he denies any miracle in connection with the composition of the Koran. If he considers the "splitting of the moon" impossible, although it is mentioned by Allah in the Koran, then, according to what he says of the processes of the mind, he is forced to conclude that he who combined the parts of the moon is unable to separate them. If, however, he accepted the "splitting of the moon" as lying within the range of ability and possibility, then what is it that made him accuse abū-Mas'ūd of being a liar, in his report of the "splitting of the moon," although Allah mentioned it in the Koran: "The hour hath approached and the Moon hath been cleft; But whenever they see a miracle they turn aside and say, 'This is well-devised magic'" (Surah 54, v. 1 and 2). Al-Naẓẓām's assertion that the "splitting of the moon" never took place, is worse than the view of the polytheists who hold that even when they saw it splitting, it took place by magic. He who denies the existence of prophetic miracles is worse than he who attempts to explain them in some other way. As to his denial of vision to the Jinn, he must verily conclude that the Jinn cannot see each other. If, however, he accepts their ability to see, why does he say that abū-Mas'ūd is lying when he claims that they can see. According to all this, al-Naẓẓām in addition to what we have reported of his error was the most corrupt of the creations of Allah, the boldest in committing major sins, and the most
136 addicted to drinking spirits. 'Abdallāh ibn-Muslim-ibn-

Ḳutaibah [1] has mentioned in his book entitled "The Difference of Tradition," that al-Naẓẓām drank spirits in the morning and the evening, singing the following verses about drink:

> "I do not cease taking the spirit of the flagon in gentleness
> And consider it legal to drink the blood of the unslain.
> Thus I was revived and felt two spirits in my body,
> While the flagon lay a body without a spirit."

In his attack on his report of the Companions, in the heresy of his views, and in the errors of his acts, his case is like that of the man about whom the following proverb is told: He who has a bad faith and is mean in his descent, does not leave a shameful act without committing it, considering it praiseworthy and permissible though it be forbidden. But are the clouds harmed by the barking of the dogs? Just as the clouds are not harmed by the barking of the dogs, so such a man does no harm.

(Here the writing breaks off, at the end of the folio 58b, and from the following it appears that several pages are lost, and that the author is now talking of Mu'ammar.) [2]

. . . . . . the phenomena of the body came from the acts of the body according to its nature. According to him, sound is the act of bodies that are sonorous by nature. The annihilation of a body is the act of the body from its nature. And the healthy or unhealthy condition of seed is, according to him, due to the acts of the seed. He also claimed that the annihilation of a finite thing is due to its own act from its nature. He claims, moreover, that in the case of phenomena, Allah has neither action nor power. And 137
holding this view that Allah creates neither life nor death, he condemns as false Allah's describing himself as one who

---

[1] Ibn-Khallikān, *ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 22.

[2] Mu'ammar ibn-'Abbād al-Sulamī. Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 67 *et seq.* Horten, *ibid.*, p. 274 *et seq.* Macdonald, *ibid.*, p. 143.

gives life or causes death, for how can he who created neither life nor death give life or death?

His second heresy is his idea that Allah created no phenomena whatever. He at the same time denied the eternal attributes of Allah, just as the rest of the Mu‘tazilah denied them. This heresy forced him to the conclusion that Allah has no word, since he could not state that Allah's word was an eternal attribute, as the Sunnites and the community did, for he did not ascribe to Allah any eternal attribute. Nor could he say that his word was his act, as the rest of the Mu‘tazilah held, because Allah, according to him, had not created any phenomena. The Koran, according to him, was the act of a body upon which the words descended, but is not an act of Allah, nor an attribute. Thus it is not possible for him to actually have a word, either in the sense of an attribute, or in the sense of an act. If he then has no word, he has no power to command, to forbid, nor to impose obligation. This involves a denial of divine obligation, and of the provisions of the Canon Law and of what others have affirmed, because he held opinions leading thereto.

His third heresy was his assertion that every kind of phenomena existing in the body is endless in number. So
138 he said if a thing moves through a motion arising in itself, this motion belongs to its bearer for the sake of (through) an idea outside of itself. This idea, again, belongs to its bearer for the sake of (through) an idea outside of itself. Thus he speaks of every idea belonging to its bearer for the sake of (through) an idea outside of it *ad infinitum*. Thus color, taste and smell—as well as any other phenomena—belongs to its bearer through an idea outside of itself. This idea again belongs to its bearer through an idea outside of itself *ad infinitum*. Al-Ka‘bī, in his treatises, relates how al-Mu‘ammar claimed that motion is opposed to rest

only through an idea outside of it. In the same way rest is opposed to motion through an idea outside of it, and these two ideas are opposed to ideas other than they. This series, according to him, may be followed *ad infinitum*.

Now such a view is heretical for two reasons. One is that he posits accidents that are unlimited, which necessitates the positing of accidents which Allah cannot count—which is directly opposed to Allah's saying, " And counteth all things by number " (Surah 72, v. 28). The second reason is that his saying that an unlimited number of phenomena have been created leads him to hold that the body is more powerful than Allah. For, according to him, Allah has created nothing but bodies, which are finite, as both we and he hold. Now, when the body creates a phenomenon, it has in that connection created phenomena that are unlimited. And naturally that which creates what is unlimited must be more powerful than that which can only create what is limited in number. In his treatises al-Ka‘bī tries to excuse al-Mu‘ammar, asserting that he was accustomed to say that man has no power of action outside of his will, the rest of the phenomena being the work of the body acting according to its nature. If this report of his views is correct, it necessarily follows that the nature, to which is ascribed the creation of the phenomena, is more powerful than Allah, for Allah produces only bodies that are limited, 139
while the nature of man produces various kinds of phenomena, every one of which kind is endless in number.

It ought further to be said that the view of al-Mu‘ammar in regard to endless phenomena opens the way for those who held the doctrines of *ẓuhūr* (appearance) and *kumūn* (masking) against that of the [orthodox] Moslems in regard to the creation of phenomena. For the [orthodox] Moslems inferred the creation of the phenomena in bodies from the fact that opposing phenomena may succeed one another in bodies. But the followers of *ẓuhūr* and *kumūn* denied the creation of phenomena and believed that they were inherent in bodies, and that whenever one phenomenon appeared in a body, its opposite was masked there, and that when a phenomenon was masked there, its opposite appeared. The Muḳaṣṣidūn said to them: "If a phenomenon is masked once and appears once, its appearance after its masking and its masking after its appearance would be due to an idea outside of it; and if not, this idea in its appearing and its masking would need an endless idea outside of it. But since the combination of endless phenomena in one body is impossible, their succession in a body through being created is proved, and not through successive masking and appearing. If, now, Mu'ammar says that the combination of unlimited phenomena in a body is possible, he cannot refute the claim of the followers of *appearance* and *masking*, that it is possible for endless phenomena of the kind called *appearance* and *masking* to be in one and the same place." This view carried to its legitimate conclusion leads to the assertion that phenomena are eternal—which is a heresy. And that which leads to such a theory must also be heresy.

140 His fourth heresy is his theory that man is something beside this sensible body, that he is living, knowing, able to act and possesses free will. But he claims that it is not man himself who moves, or keeps quiet, or is colored, or sees, or touches, or changes from place to place, nor does one place contain him to the exclusion of another. If he were asked, "Do you say that man is in this body, or in the sky, or in the earth, or in paradise, or in hell?", he would answer, "I do not deny any of this, but I assert that he is in the body as something led, in paradise as something given delight, or in hell as something given punishment; he is, however, neither present nor contained in any one of these places, because he has neither length, breadth, depth, nor

weight." He thus ascribes attributes to man which are ascribed to Allah, in that he says that man is living and knowing and able to act and wise, attributes which must necessarily be applied to Allah. Then he denies that man can move, or be at rest, or be hot, or cold, or wet, or dry, that he possesses color, or weight, or taste, or smell. Allah also is free from such attributes. And just as he claims that man, when in the body, is its manager, but is not there in the sense of being present or contained, so, according to him, Allah is in every place, in the sense that he is managing it, and knowing what is happening in it, but not in the sense of being present or contained in it. It is almost as if by describing man as Allah is described, he wishes him to be worshipped. He did not, however, think it meet to express quite this opinion, so he merely said something that would naturally lead to it. Moreover, this view entails the idea that it is impossible for man to see man, and therefore it follows that the Companions did not see the Prophet of Allah, 141 a view which is in itself sufficiently shameful.

His fifth heresy was his view that it is not proper to say of Allah that he is ancient, and yet at the same time describing him as existent and eternal.

His sixth heresy was his refusal to say that Allah knows himself, because he considers it essential for the thing known to be separate from the thing knowing. This view of his, however, is proved false by the fact that a speaker may mention himself, because if it is possible for his own self to be mentioned by a speaker, it is also possible for a knower to know his own self. Al-Ka'bī boasted in his writings to the effect that Mu'ammar was one of his Mu'tazilah teachers. Now anyone who boasts of his likeness to the like of him can keep it, just as the poet has said:

> "Is there any buyer as long as Sa'īd is the seller?
> Is there any seller as long as Sa'īd is the buyer?"

6. *Concerning the Bishrīyah among them.* These are the followers of Bishr ibn-al-Mu'tamir.[1] Some of his brother Ḳadarīyah condemned his views on certain points in which he is considered right by other Ḳadarīyah. For instance, they condemned his view that Allah was capable of so much kindness that if he showed it to an infidel, it would make that infidel involuntarily a believer. They also condemned his view that if Allah had first created the wise in paradise, thus favoring them, it would have been better for them. They also condemned his view that if Allah should know that by lengthening the life of a man, that slave would become a believer, then to lengthen his life would be better for him than to have him die a heretic. Moreover, they
142 condemned his view that Allah does not cease desiring; and also his view that if Allah knows that a certain act is to be committed by a man and does not forbid it, then he has desired its occurrence. In these five views which the Baṣrah Mu'tazilah condemned, Bishr was right while in reality those who condemned him were themselves worthy of condemnation. All the other matters, however, are hateful heresies, and we condemn Bishr as an unbeliever. First of all, we condemn his view that Allah is not a friend to the believer in the state of his belief, nor an enemy to an unbeliever in the state of his unbelief. It was necessary to condemn him for this, since it is contrary to the view of all Moslems as well as our immediate followers; for we say that Allah does not cease being a friend to him whom he knows to have been his friend, while he was alive; and an enemy to him whom he knows to have been an unbeliever during his life and to have died in his unbelief. He is therefore his enemy before his unbelief, in the state of his unbelief, and after his death. As to these main points, the Mu'tazilah, all except Bishr, held that Allah is not a friend to a man before

---

[1] See note on page 134.

the existence of obedience in him was possible; it is only in the state of obedience that he becomes his friend. In the same way he is an enemy to the unbeliever only in the state of his unbelief; moreover, if the believer returned to his unbelief, Allah becomes his enemy after having been his friend, according to them. Bishr, however, claimed that Allah is not the friend of the obedient in the state of the existence of his obedience, nor an enemy to the unbeliever in the state of the existence of his unbelief. He is only friendly to the obedient in the second state where obedience exists,[1] and he is the enemy of the unbeliever only in the second state where his unbelief exists. He gave as proof of this, that if it is right that Allah should be a friend to the obedient [only] 143
in the state of his obedience, and an enemy to him [only] in the state of his unbelief, then it is right to reward the obedient in the state of his obedience, and to punish the unbeliever in the state of his unbelief. But our followers say: "If Allah does so, it is right." Bishr, however, said that if this [conclusion] is right, then it must follow that the unbeliever can be transformed in his state of unbelief. We say that if Allah does so, it is right.

The second of Bishr's heresies is the fact that he exaggerated his view about reproduction to such an extent that he claimed it possible for a man to create color and taste and smell and sight and hearing and the rest of the sensations according to the method of reproduction, provided he is the author of that which causes them. The same is true of his view of heat and cold, wetness and dryness. Our own followers and the rest of the Mu'tazilah declared him a heretic, because of his assertion that man can create color, taste, smell and the sensations.

His third heresy is his theory that Allah may forgive a man his sins and then change his mind about such forgiveness and punish him when the man is again disobedient. Bishr was questioned about this: "If an unbeliever had turned from his unbelief, and drank wine after having repented from his unbelief, without considering it legal to drink wine, and death should seize him before he had repented from his drinking of wine, would Allah punish him on the last day for his unbelief for which he repented?" He said "yes." It was then said to him: "According to this, then, the punishment for such a sin on the part of those who are of the Moslem community is like the punishment of the unbeliever." And Bishr had to accept this deduction.

---

[1] *i. e.* he is not his friend *before* he becomes obedient, nor his enemy *before* he becomes disobedient.

144 His fourth heresy is his theory that if Allah punished a baby, he would be acting unjustly towards it in meting out such punishment, for if Allah does this, the baby would have to be grown up, sensible, and deserving of punishment. This is the same as if he said that Allah has power to act unjustly, and if he acts unjustly, then, indeed through this injustice he becomes just! Thus the beginning of this theory contradicts the conclusion. Our followers say that Allah has the power to punish babies; if he does so, his act must be a just one. Their views in this matter are not contradictory, but Bishr's view is.

His fifth heresy is his view that [when a body moves from one place to another] motion exists, but not in the body, either as it is in the first or the second place; but that the body moves through it from the first to the second place. This view is unreasonable in itself. Theologians before him disagreed as to whether motion is an "unsubstantial reality" (*ma'nā*) or not. Those who do not believe in phenomena said no; while those who believed in phenomena differ over the time of the occurrence of motion, some of them claiming that it starts in the body when the body is in the first place, and the body then passes through it from the

first to the second place. To this agree al-Naẓẓām and abū-Shimr al-Murji'.[1] Others said that motion exists in the body when the latter has reached the second place, because it is the first time the body exists in the second place. This is the view of abū-al-Hudhail and al-Jubbā'ī and his son abū-Hāshim. Our sheikh abū-l-Ḥasan al-Ash'ari says about this: "Some of them say that motion is two substances in two [separate] places. One of them occurs in the moving body while it is in the first place, the second occurs in the body when it is in the second place." This is the view 145 of al-Ruwandī[2] and also of our sheikh abū-al-'Abbās al-Ḳalānisī.[3] The view of Bishr ibn-al-Mu'tamar differs from these views because he claims that motion takes place while the body is neither in the first nor the second place, although we know that there is no state between the first and the second. If this view is unreasonable even for him, how can it be reasonable for others?

7. *Concerning the Hishāmīyah.* These are the followers of Hishām ibn-'Amr al-Fūṭī.[4] His heresies follow in succession his [initial] heresy about predestnation. Among them is the fact that he borbids men to say (Surah 3, v. 167): "Our Allah is our sufficiency, and he is our best guardian [*wakīl*]," because he does not consider it right to call Allah a guardian. But the Koran gives this quality to Allah, and it is also mentioned in the Sunnah which has been handed

---

[1] Muḥammad Badr points this *abū-Shimr*, but no such man is mentioned by the leading writers on these heresies, while Shahrastānī mentions abū-*Shāmir*, a Murji', vol. i, p. 160 *et seq.*, Horten mentions this same man on p. 304. As abū-Shāmir was also a pupil of al-Naẓẓam it seems justifiable to conclude that this is the man to whom Baghdādī is referring.

[2] Horten, *ibid.*, p. 350 *et seq.* Ibn-Khallikān, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 76.

[3] Horten, *ibid.*, p. 375.

[4] Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 74.

down concerning the ninety-nine names of Allah. If this name cannot be applied to Allah, in spite of the fact that it is written in the Koran, and handed down in the authentic Sunnah, then what other names should be applied to him? Our followers used to wonder at the Baṣrah Mu'tazilah who applied names to Allah that were not mentioned in the Koran and the Sunnah, even if there is analogy for them. Their wonder increased still more when al-Fūṭī forbade them to apply to Allah those attributes which were mentioned of him in the Koran and the Sunnah.

Al-Khaiyāṭ defended al-Fūṭī by saying that Hishām used to say: "Our sufficiency is in Allah, he is the best to depend upon [*mutawakkal alaihi*]," in place of "guardian." He claimed that the word guardian implied someone above him (to make him guardian). This, however, is a sign of the ignorance of Hishām and of him who defended him by
146 resorting to the meanings of nouns in the language. The word guardian really means "the one who is sufficient," because he suffices the one under his guardianship in what is given him to guard. This is the meaning of his saying, "Our sufficiency is in Allah, and he is the best guardian." And also the meaning of "our sufficiency" is our adequacy. It is therefore necessary that what follows the word "best" should agree with the word that precedes it, as when we say "Allah is our supplier, and he is the best supplier," we do not say "Allah is our supplier, and he is the best forgiver." Besides, Allah said, "He who depends on Allah, Allah is his sufficiency, *i. e.* his satisfier." Guardian [*wakīl*] may also mean in the Koran "one in charge of us," "Say I am not in charge of you" (Surah 6, v. 66), *i. e.* your protector; and the opposite of protector would be a stupid man. If guardian means protector, and if Allah is a satisfier and a protector, then we should not forbid the use of the word guardian among his actual names.

The remarkable thing is that Hishām permitted this name for Allah to be written and read in the Koran. But he did not permit its use outside of the Ḳoran.

The second of al-Fūṭī's heresies is his prohibition of the use of many things uttered in the Koran. He also prohibited men from saying that Allah unites the hearts of believers and causes the evil to err. This is in opposition to the words of Allah, "Hadst thou spent all the riches of the earth, thou couldst not have united their hearts; but Allah hath united them" (Surah 8, v. 64), and to his words, "But the wicked shall he cause to err" (Surah 14, v. 32), and to his words, "But none will he mislead thereby except the wicked" (Surah 2, v. 27). Moreover, he rejected the say- 147
ing in the Koran that Allah blinds the unbelievers. 'Ubād ibn-Sulaimān al-'Amrī ('Umari?) agreed with this error, and forbade men to say that Allah created the unbelievers, because the word unbeliever is a name for two things, man and his unbelief, but according to him Allah is not the creator of his unbelief. On this analogy, it follows that one should not say that Allah created the believer, because the word believer is a name for two things, man and belief, but Allah, according to him, is not the creator of man's belief. Similarly one should never say, "one has killed an unbeliever or has struck him," because the word unbeliever refers to both man and his unbelief, and unbelief cannot be killed or struck. 'Ubād also rejected the saying that Allah "is the third to every two, and the fourth to every three," which contradicts the saying of Allah in the Koran: "Three persons speak not privately together but he is their fourth, nor five but he is their sixth" (Surah 58, v. 8). He also rejected the saying that Allah increases the days of the unbeliever, and this in spite of his word in the Koran: "We only give them length of days that they may increase their sins" (Surah 3, v. 179). If 'Ubād took this error from his pre-

ceptor Hishām, it is like the case of 'Aṣa coming from 'Āṣīyah,[1] "the snake gives birth to naught but a snake." But if this assertion of his is original, then the student would have drawn this from his teacher by analogy, for the teacher rejected the word guardian and guarantor from among the names of Allah.

148 The third of al-Fūṭī's heresies is his view concerning phenomena. He held that nothing in them predicates anything about Allah. His companion 'Ubād said the same, both claiming that the "separation of the sea," and the "changing of a stick into a snake," and the "splitting of the moon," and the "secret of the twilight," and the "walking on the waters" (see above, page 156) do not verify the Prophet's claim to prophecy. Al-Fūṭī claims that the evidences supposed to come from Allah must be perceptible, just as bodies are perceptible, and are therefore evidences for Allah. They are phenomena which can be known through deductive proofs. But if Allah is to be made evident by this, these evidences must each have another evidence to prove them, and so on *ad infinitum.* It was objected that if he held to such an evidence, he would have to say that phenomena do not prove anything, nor do they even prove a basis for a legal decision; because if they proved a thing or a decision, in proving it they would need to prove the truth of the evidence used in bringing such proof and each evidence must have another evidence to prove it, and so on *ad infinitum.* And if phenomena prove nothing, and give no decision, then the proof of the word of Allah and the word of the prophet of Allah about that which is legal and that which is illegal, and that which is promised and that which is threatened, is abrogated. Among phenomena, however, are some whose existence

---

[1] Muḥammad Badr in a footnote says that 'Aṣā is the name of a horse and 'Āṣīyah is the mother of that horse.

is known by necessity, such as colors, tastes, smells, motion and quiet; it necessarily follows that these known phenomena are evidence for Allah because they are perceptible, just as bodies are evidence for Allah bcause they are perceptible. Now if al-Fūṭī says that phenomena are not perceptible, because those who deny phenomena have 149 doubted their existence, one can say: "The Najjārīyah and the Ḍarārīyah have doubted the existence of the body which was not a phenomenon, for they asserted that bodies are a conglomerate of phenomena." And arguing from analogy, it follows that bodies cannot be known of necessity, and if . . . . . . [break in text].

His fourth heresy is his view concerning "interruption and continuation." He maintained that if a man performs the ablutions for prayer and begins praying, thus drawing near to Allah with the determination to complete the prayer, and then recites and genuflects and prays to Allah in the proper manner, but interrupts it before the end, the beginning of the prayer as well as its end is sin, for Allah has forbidden him this, and has prohibited it. Nevertheless he has no way of knowing before the beginning that he is going to commit a sin and so avoiding it. The community before his time, however, agreed that the part of the prayer which has been performed is an act of obedience to Allah, even though the prayer is not completed, as for example, if he died during it, what he had already performed would be an act of obedience, even if the whole prayer was not completed.

His fifth heresy is his denial that 'Uthmān was besieged and was murdered by conquest and force. He claims that a small band surprised and killed him without a regular siege. And he who rejects the view that 'Uthmān was besieged, in spite of the successive traditions about it which have been handed down, is like him who rejects the battles of

Badr and ʻUḥud, in spite of the successive traditions which have been handed down about them. He is also like the man who rejects the miracles about which traditions have been handed down.

150 His sixth heresy is the view which he expresses in the chapter on the "Community"; that when the community comes to a consensus of opinion, forsaking tyranny and corruption, then it needs an Imām to manage it; and that when it rebels and sins and kills its Imām, the Imāmship should not be fixed upon anyone under these conditions. By that he meant to attack the Imāmship of ʻAlī, because the Imāmship was given to him during a rebellion, and after the killing of the Imām preceding him. This agreed with the view of their al-Aṣamm,[1] that the Imāmship should remain only with him upon whom the consensus of the community rested. By this view he only wished to attack the Imāmship of ʻAlī, because the community did not agree about him, for the Syrians were championing someone else until ʻAlī died. While rejecting the Imāmship of ʻAlī he accepted that of Muʻāwiyah, because after the killing of ʻAlī the people were unanimous about him. The Rāfiḍah, who inclined to the Muʻtazilah views, were thoroughly satisfied with the attack of the sheikhs of the Muʻtazilah on the Imāmship of ʻAlī, after the doubt of their leader, Wāṣil, about the testimony of ʻAlī and his followers.

His seventh heresy is his view that whoever says that paradise and hell are created, should be condemned as a heretic. His successors among the Muʻtazilah doubt the existence of paradise and hell to-day, but they do not condemn the man who says that they are created. Those convinced of the creation of paradise and hell condemn those who deny their existence, and they swear by Allah that he

---

[1] Horten, *ibid.*, p. 298.

who denies them will not enter paradise and will not be freed from hell.

His eighth heresy is his denial of the marriage of the virgins in paradise. He who denies this is not worthy to enter paradise, how much less to marry a virgin there! Besides the errors which we have recounted of him, al-Fūṭī believes in killing those who differed from him with secret cunning, even if they belong to the Moslem community. The 151 Sunnites said of al-Fūṭī and his followers that their blood and their possessions belonged to the Moslems, and that they had the usual right to a fifth of the spoils. Nor should retaliation be demanded of one who kills one of them nor blood-wit nor atonement. Indeed, a certain rank and station is to be awarded to the one killing him, for which praise be to Allah.

8. *Concerning the Murdārīyah among them.* These are the followers of ʻĪsā ibn-Ṣabīḥ, known as abū-Mūsā al-Murdār.[1] He was called the monk of the Muʻtazilah; the surname suited him, though the term was taken from the Christian monks. His surname al-Murdār was also well suited. In general, the verse may be applied to him: "Thine eyes seldom see a man whose appearance does not remind you of his surname."

This Murdār claimed that men had the power to produce something similar to the Koran, and even something more eloquent, as al-Naẓẓām had said. But in this way they show stubborn opposition to the word of Allah: "Say, verily were men and Jinn assembled to produce the like of this Koran; they could not produce its like, though the one should help the other" (Surah 17, v. 90). In addition to his various errors, al-Murdār condemned the person in close communication with a Sultan, claiming that he can

---

[1] Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 71, *muzdar.* Horten, *ibid.*, index, p. 642.

neither inherit nor can he bequeath. His predecessors among the Mu‘tazilah, who agreed with him as regards fate and secession, said of the person holding communication with a Sultan, that he was a shameful person, but could not be called either a believer or an unbeliever. Murdār, however, held that such a person was an unbeliever. It is a
152 wonder that the Sultan of his time refrained from killing him, considering his condemnation of the Sultan himself and of those who associated with him. He also claimed that Allah could act tyrannically and lie; for if he really carried out what he was able to do in the way of tyranny and lying, Allah would become a tyrannous and lying God.

Abū-Zufar reports of al-Murdār that he admitted that a deed could exist which was the result of two created doers, the deed being created in the way of generation. He held this view in spite of the fact that he rejected the opinion of the Sunnites that a deed could result from two doers, one of them being creator and the other acquirer. Al-Murdār also claimed that he who admitted that Allah could be seen by the eye though without form, is an unbeliever, while he who doubts that such a man is an unbeliever, is an unbeliever himself; and so is the man who has doubts of the man who doubts, and so on *ad infinitum*. The rest of the Mu‘tazilah agreed to condemn only him who admitted that Allah could be seen when man confronted him, or when the rays of the sight of the seer reached the seen. Those who assert that there is sight, are united in condemning al-Murdār, as well as those who doubt his condemnation. The Mu‘tazilah report that when death came to al-Murdār he gave the dying command that his goods should be given as alms and that none of his possessions were to be given to his heirs. Abū-al-Ḥusain al-Khaiyāṭ tried to excuse him for this, saying: "The right to some of his goods was questionable, and the poor had a claim on them." By this excuse

he only proved that al-Murdār was a robber and a betrayer of the poor. And the robber, according to the Mu‘tazilah is a shameless person, condemned to eternal hell. The rest of the Mu‘tazilah condemned him because of his view about the generation of one deed by two creators. Al-Murdār himself condemned abū-al-Hudhail for his view about the annihilation of the powers of Allah. He wrote a book on this, and he condemned his own teacher Bishr ibn-al-Mu‘tamar for his view about the creation of colors, tastes, smells 153
and perceptions. He also condemned al-Naẓẓām's view that created things are the deed of Allah. This, he said, would necessitate the acceptance of the views of the Christians, namely, that "the Messiah, the son of Allah, was a creation of Allah." This would make of him a Mu‘tazilah in monkish dress! He condemned his sheikhs, and his sheikhs condemned him. Both parties are justified in condemning each other.

9. *Concerning the Ja‘farīyah.* These are the followers of two Ja‘fars among them, one is Ja‘far ibn-Ḥarb[1] and the other is Ja‘far ibn-Mubashshir. Both of them attained the heights of error and the depths of ignorance. As to Ja‘far ibn-Mubashshir, he claimed that among the corrupt of this community there are some who are worse than the Jews, Christians, Magians and Zindiks.[2] This was in spite of his view that these same corrupt persons were unitarians, and neither believers nor unbelievers. He thus made the unitarian who is not an unbeliever worse than the infidel dualist. The least we can oppose to this view of his is to say to him: "According to us, thou art worse than all unbelievers on the face of the earth." He also claimed that

---

[1] Only alluded to by Shahrastānī. Both of the Ja‘fars are to be found in Mas‘ūdī, *Les Prairies d'Or*, vol. v, p. 443 and vol. vii, p. 231. Horten, *ibid.*, pp. 290, 295.

[2] A Thānawīyah or dualist, also applied to an unbeliever.

the consensus of the companions to the effect that he who drinks spirituous wine should be beaten, is wrong, because their agreement is reached through speculation (not given in the Koran or tradition). Ja'far shares this heresy of his with the Najadat among the Khawārij, who condemn punishment for the use of liquor. The theologians of the community unite in condemning him who rejects the punishment for drinking raw wine, they differ only about *nabīdh*,[1] provided one does not get drunk from it. If one does, however, get drunk from it, then, according to the view of the followers of speculation and tradition, one deserves punishment in spite of those who disagree with this view. 154 Ibn-Mubashshir also claimed that he who steals a single grain, or even something less, is corrupt, and is condemned to hell. In this he differs from his predecessors who maintained that minor sins may be forgiven, if their author avoids the major ones. He also claimed that the condemnation of the guilty to hell-fire can be inferred by mental processes, thereby differing from his predecessors, that such a thing was known through the law and not through reason. Moreover, he claims that if a man send to a woman, asking her to marry him, and she come to him, and he take and possess her without a contract, she is not to be punished, because she came to him with the idea of being married. But the punishment must fall upon the man, because he intended fornication. This ignorant man did not know that she who gives in to fornication is a fornicator unless she is forced. The legists differ only about a man who forces a woman to commit fornication, some holding that the woman should have a dowry and the man be punished. Al-Shāfi'ī and the legists of al-Ḥijāz agree about this. Some withhold the punishment of the man because they consider that the dowry is sufficient punishment for him. But not

---

[1] Date-wine.

one of the early Moslems thought it right to withhold punishment from a woman who gives in to fornication, which was ibn-Mubashshir's view. The opposition of the consensus is sufficient shame for him. As for Ja'far ibn-Ḥarb, he shared in the errors of his preceptor, al-Murdār, and also added his view to the effect that a part of the whole is different from the whole. This amounts to saying that the whole is different from itself, since all parts of it are different from it. He also claimed that what is forbidden by the mind has power over (that) mind, but has no power over another thing. This is what al-Sha'bi[1] said of him in his treatises. On this basis it was necessary that he should hold that he who knows a thing does not know it! 155 'Abd-al-Ḳāhir says: " Ibn-Ḥarb wrote a book explaining his errors; but we have refuted his book, by a book called *Harb (war) against ibn-Ḥarb*, and in it, by the help of Allah and his gifts, we refute its bases and its principles.

10. *Concerning the Iskāfīyah among them.* These are the followers of Muḥammad ibn-'Abdallāh al-Iskāfī.[2] He took his errors about predestination from Ja'far ibn-Ḥarb, but came to differ over certain of his deductions. He claimed that to Allah can be attributed the power to oppress children and madmen, but not those who have their full senses. He disagreed with the view of al-Naẓẓām, according to which Allah had not the power to act unjustly or to lie. He likewise disagreed with the view of those of his predecessors who hold that Allah could practice injustice and lie, but does not do so because he knows that they are both abominations, and that he can do without them. Between these two views he took a middle course, according to which

---

[1] Misprint in Baghdādī for al-Shāfi'ī.

[2] Horten, *ibid.*, p. 299 *et seq.* Mas'ūdī, *ibid.*, vol. vi, p. 58; vol. vii, p. 231.

he claimed that Allah has the power to act unjustly only to those who have no mind, but not to those who have their senses. His predecessors condemned him for this, and he condemned them for differing from him. He became so abstruse in his heresy as to say that it could be said that Allah spoke to his subjects, but that it could not be said that he spoke *with* them. Moreover he calls Allah the addressor but not the conversor. He claimed that in using the word conversor it would mean that the word arises in him, which is not the case with the addressor. Just as the use of the word "who sets something in motion" implies that the motion commences in him, so does the expression "who converses" imply that the speaking commences with him. We believe this to be true; the word of Allah we believe originates with him. As to his predecessors among the Ḳadarīyah, verily they would say to him: "This excuse of
156 yours forces you to conclude that that part of the body of man that 'speaks' is the tongue. This is enough because, according to you, the word dwells in the tongue. You must, indeed, accept this absurdity that applies the name of the speaker to a *thing*, because the word, according to you and the rest of the Mu‘tazilah, is composed of letters, and it is not possible for one letter to be a word. The place of each letter among the letters of the word is different from the place of the rest of the letters. Your reasoning would, therefore, mean that man could not be a speaker, nor could any part of him be a speaker. And according to your assertion, 'Allah is not the speaker because the word does not arise within him'."

Some of the Mu‘tazilah glorified al-Iskāfī, by claiming that when Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥasan saw him walking, he dismounted from his horse. Evidently this is a lie, because al-Iskāfī did not live at the time of Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥasan, for ibn-al-Ḥasan died in al-Rai during the caliphate

of Hārūn al-Rashīd, while al-Iskāfī was not alive in the time of al-Rashīd; and even if he had been alive in the time of Muḥammad, Muḥammad would not have dismounted from his horse for a man whom he considered a heretic. Hishām ibn-‘Ubaidallāh al-Rāzī reported as the word of Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥasan that whoever follows a Mu‘tazilah in prayer, his prayers must be repeated. Hishām also reported of Yaḥya ibn-Aktham,[1] who had it from abū-Yūsuf, that he was questioned about the Mu‘tazilah and said, "They are Zindiḳs." Al-Shāfi‘ī has pointed out in his book *Al-Ḳiyās* his refusal to accept the testimony of the witness of the Mu‘tazilah and the people led astray by their desires [*Ahl al-Ahwā'*]. In this question Mālik and the legal authorities of al-Madīnah agree. If that is so, how could the Imāms of Islām, who condemned the Ḳadarīyah, honor them by dismounting for them?

11. *Concerning the Thamāmīyah among them.* These are 157
the followers of Thamāmah ibn-Ashras al-Numairī,[2] one of their freedmen. He was the leader of the Ḳadarīyah in the time of al-Ma'mūn, al-Mu‘taṣim and al-Wāthiḳ. It is said that he is the one who led al-Ma'mūn astray by making him a Mu‘tazilite. Two heresies distinguished him from the rest of the predecessors of the Mu‘tazilah, and it was for these that the whole community condemned him. One of these heresies was that when he shared the opinions of the "companions of wisdom" in their assertion that knowledge is necessary, he claimed that he whom Allah does not compel to know him (Allah), is not compelled to know, nor is he prohibited from unbelief, but is created for unpaid work and slave labor, and is therefore to be classed with animals who are not responsible. As a result of this, he claimed

---

[1] Mas‘ūdī, *ibid*. General index.

[2] Not in Shahrastānī.

that the community of al-Dahrīyah and the Christians, and the Zindiḳs, become dust in the end. He also claimed that the next world is only the abode of reward or punishment, so for the one who died as a child, or who knows Allah by necessity, there is no virtue for which they deserve a reward, nor sin for which they deserve punishment. Thus they become dust, since they have no share in reward or punishment.

Thamāmah's second heresy is his view that generated acts are acts without an author. This error leads to the denial of the creator of the world, because if it is true that one deed can exist without a doer, it is possible for every deed to exist without a doer, and then one could not prove the existence of the doer from the deeds, nor would the creation of the world be a proof of its creator. This would be similar to the assertion that there could be writing without 158 a writer, or erasing without one who erases, or a building without a builder. It might be said to him: "According to you then, the word of man is a deed without a doer. Why do you then blame man for his lies and his words of unbelief, since, according to you, he is not the author of his act of lying, or his words of unbelief?"

Among his shameful heresies Thamāmah used also to say that the abode of Islām was the abode of polytheism. Moreover, he forbade captivity because the captive, according to him, could not have disobeyed his Lord, not having known him. According to him, also, rebellion is possible only for him who knows his Lord by necessity and then denies him, or rebels against him. From this assertion, it follows that he confesses himself a son of adultery because he belonged to the freedmen, while his mother was a captive, and to enter in to one who could not be a captive, according to the law governing capture, is adultery. His children are therefore children of adultery. Thamāmah's heresy about this matter suited his pedigree.

The historians report wonderful things regarding the imbecility of Thamāmah and his shamelessness. Among these is what 'Abdallāh ibn-Muslīm ibn-Ḳutaibah said in his book *Mukhtalaf al-Ḥadīth.* He said in this that Thamāmah ibn-Ashras saw men on a Friday hastening to the mosque for fear the hour of prayer would pass. Whereupon he said to a companion of his, " Look at these donkeys and cows." Then he said, " What has that Arab made out of men?", meaning the Prophet of Allah.

Al-Jāḥiẓ said in his book of jests that al-Ma'mūn was riding one day when he saw Thamāmah drunk, and rolling in the mud, and he said, " Thamāmah?" Thamāmah replied, " Yes, by Allah." "Aren't you ashamed?" " No, by Allah." " Upon thee be the curse of Allah." " Let it come." Al-Jāḥiẓ also said that a servant of Thamāmah 159 said to him one day, "Arise and pray," but he paid no attention. And the servant said to him, " The time is short, arise and pray and rest," and Thamāmah replied, " I will rest if you will leave me."

The author of *Ta'rīkh al-Marāwizah* says that Thamāmah ibn-Ashras accused Aḥmad ibn-Naṣr al-Marwazī to al-Wāthiḳ,[1] saying that the former condemned everyone who denies that Allah can be seen, and everyone who claims that the Koran was created, and is free from the heresy of al-Ḳadarīyah. Wāthiḳ thereupon put him to death, but promptly repented of his death, and blamed Thamāmah, ibn-abi-Dā'ūd [2] and ibn-al-Zaiyāt [3] who advised his death. Ibn-al-Zaiyāt said to him: " If his death does not have good results, may Allah slay me between fire and water." Ibn-abi-Dā'ūd said: " May Allah imprison me in my skin if his death was not the right thing." Thamāmah said: " May

---

[1] Ṭabarī ed. Zotenberg, vol. iv, p. 546.

[2] Ibn-Khallikān, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 61.

[3] Fihrist, p. 122.

Allah cause swords to rule over me, if you were not right in killing him." Allah answered the prayers of each one in his own way. As to ibn-al-Zaiyāt, verily he was killed in the bath, and fell into the fire with his clothes on, and thus died between fire and water. As to ibn-abi-Dā'ūd, al-Mutawakkil imprisoned him, and he had a stroke of paralysis while in prison, thus remaining imprisoned in his skin by paralysis until he died. And as for Thamāmah, he went to Mecca where the Khuzā'ah saw him between al-Ṣafā and al-Marwah, and one of the men called out and said: "O ye men of Khuzā'ah, this is the man who conspired against your master, Aḥmad ibn-Fihr, and it was he who caused his death." Whereupon the banu-Khuzā'ah gathered against him with their swords and killed him. Then they brought his body out from the sacred enclosure, and the wild animals outside devoured it. Thus Allah's words
160 were fulfilled: "And they tasted the harmfulness of their own conduct: and the end of their conduct was ruin" (Surah 65, v. 9).

12. *Concerning the Jāḥiẓīyah among them.* These are the followers of 'Amr ibn-Baḥr al-Jāḥiẓ.[1] They are the people who were led away by the beauty of the language used by al-Jāḥiẓ in his books, about which we might say: "They are compositions which are clear, though they have no meaning, and contain words which terrify, though they have no substance." Had they known the ignorance shown in his heresies, far from ascribing beauties to him, they would have begged Allah's pardon for calling him a man. Among the errors ascribed to him, which al-Ka'bī, in spite of his pride in him, relates about him in his treatises, are the words: "All knowledge comes by nature, nevertheless it is an

---

[1] Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 77. Mas'ūdī, *ibid.*, vol. iii, pp. 22-25; vol. v, p. 80; vol. viii, pp. 33-36. Ibn-Khallikān, *ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 405.

activity of man in which he has no choice." They add that al-Jāḥiẓ agreed with Thamāmah that man has no other activity except the will, and that the rest of his acts are ascribed to man only in the sense that they occur by nature, and naturally arise from his will." He says that he also claimed that it is not possible to become an adult without knowing Allah. According to him, infidels are stubborn, though knowing, taken up with a love for their particular school, thankless for the knowledge he (Muḥammad) has of his creator, and the truth preached by his messengers. If al-Jāḥiẓ agrees with al-Ka'bī that man does nothing without free-will, he is then obliged to maintain that man does not pray, nor fast, nor go on a pilgrimage, nor commit adultery, nor steal, nor calumniate, nor kill. Because, according to him, it is not he that performs prayer, nor fasts, nor makes a pilgrimage, nor commits adultery, nor steals, nor kills, nor calumniates. For these acts, according to him, are not done with his will. And if these acts which we have mentioned are, according to him, natural and not acquired, it must necessarily follow that man should in no sense have reward or punishment for them, because man 161
cannot be rewarded or punished for what he has not acquired himself; just as he is not rewarded or punished for his color, or the mechanism of his members, since these are not of his own attaining.

Among the heresies of al-Jāḥiẓ is also his view of the impossibility of the annihilation of the bodies after their creation. This results in the view that Allah is able to create a thing, but is unable to annihilate it; and that he cannot remain alone after he has created a creation, in the same way that he was alone before he created it. But we, even if we say that Allah does not annihilate paradise and its pleasures, and hell and its torments, do not mean it in the sense that Allah has not the power to annihilate all

Allah cause swords to rule over me, if you were not right in killing him." Allah answered the prayers of each one in his own way. As to ibn-al-Zaiyāt, verily he was killed in the bath, and fell into the fire with his clothes on, and thus died between fire and water. As to ibn-abi-Dā'ūd, al-Mutawakkil imprisoned him, and he had a stroke of paralysis while in prison, thus remaining imprisoned in his skin by paralysis until he died. And as for Thamāmah, he went to Mecca where the Khuzā'ah saw him between al-Ṣafā and al-Marwah, and one of the men called out and said: "O ye men of Khuzā'ah, this is the man who conspired against your master, Aḥmad ibn-Fihr, and it was he who caused his death." Whereupon the banu-Khuzā'ah gathered against him with their swords and killed him. Then they brought his body out from the sacred enclosure, and the wild animals outside devoured it. Thus Allah's words
160 were fulfilled: "And they tasted the harmfulness of their own conduct: and the end of their conduct was ruin" (Surah 65, v. 9).

12. *Concerning the Jāḥiẓīyah among them.* These are the followers of 'Amr ibn-Baḥr al-Jāḥiẓ.[1] They are the people who were led away by the beauty of the language used by al-Jāḥiẓ in his books, about which we might say: "They are compositions which are clear, though they have no meaning, and contain words which terrify, though they have no substance." Had they known the ignorance shown in his heresies, far from ascribing beauties to him, they would have begged Allah's pardon for calling him a man. Among the errors ascribed to him, which al-Ka'bī, in spite of his pride in him, relates about him in his treatises, are the words: "All knowledge comes by nature, nevertheless it is an

---

[1] Shahrastānī, *ibid.*, vol. i, p. 77. Mas'ūdī, *ibid.*, vol. iii, pp. 22-25; vol. v, p. 80; vol. viii, pp. 33-36. Ibn-Khallikān, *ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 405.

activity of man in which he has no choice." They add that al-Jāḥiẓ agreed with Thamāmah that man has no other activity except the will, and that the rest of his acts are ascribed to man only in the sense that they occur by nature, and naturally arise from his will." He says that he also claimed that it is not possible to become an adult without knowing Allah. According to him, infidels are stubborn, though knowing, taken up with a love for their particular school, thankless for the knowledge he (Muḥammad) has of his creator, and the truth preached by his messengers. If al-Jāḥiẓ agrees with al-Ka'bī that man does nothing without free-will, he is then obliged to maintain that man does not pray, nor fast, nor go on a pilgrimage, nor commit adultery, nor steal, nor calumniate, nor kill. Because, according to him, it is not he that performs prayer, nor fasts, nor makes a pilgrimage, nor commits adultery, nor steals, nor kills, nor calumniates. For these acts, according to him, are not done with his will. And if these acts which we have mentioned are, according to him, natural and not acquired, it must necessarily follow that man should in no
sense have reward or punishment for them, because man 161
cannot be rewarded or punished for what he has not acquired himself; just as he is not rewarded or punished for his color, or the mechanism of his members, since these are not of his own attaining.

Among the heresies of al-Jāḥiẓ is also his view of the impossibility of the annihilation of the bodies after their creation. This results in the view that Allah is able to create a thing, but is unable to annihilate it; and that he cannot remain alone after he has created a creation, in the same way that he was alone before he created it. But we, even if we say that Allah does not annihilate paradise and its pleasures, and hell and its torments, do not mean it in the sense that Allah has not the power to annihilate all this. We mean only that paradise and hell are everlasting in a general way.

Among the heresies of al-Jāḥiẓ there is also his view that Allah does not cause anyone to enter hell, but that hell attracts its people of itself by its very nature, and then holds on to them of itself forever. This would also compel the view that paradise attracts people to itself by its nature, and that Allah does not cause anyone to enter paradise. If one were to hold this view, the desire for Allah's rewards would cease, and the use of prayer would be gone. On the other hand, if he said that Allah caused those who should go to paradise to enter paradise, he would also have to say that he caused the people of hell to enter hell. Al-Ka'bī boasts about al-Jāḥiẓ, claiming that he was one of the sheikhs of the Mu'tazilah. He also boasts of his many literary works, and claims that he was a Kinānī of the banu-Kinānah, ibn-
162 Khuzaimah ibn-Mudrakah ibn-Ilyās ibn-Mudhar. It might be said to al-Ka'bī: “If he [al-Jāḥiẓ] was a Kinānī as you claim, why did he write the book, *The boasting of the Kaḥṭānīyah over the Kinānīyah and the rest of the 'Adnānīyah?* Moreover, if he was an Arab, then why did he write the book, *The Superiority of the Freedmen over the Arabs?* Moreover, he mentioned in his book called, *Concerning the Boasting of Ḳaḥṭān over 'Adnān*, a number of poems in which Kahṭān satirizes 'Adnān. And in truth the man who delights in the satires against his fathers is like the man who himself satirizes his father. In satirizing ibn-Bassām [1] who satirized his own father, Jaḥẓah [2] has rightly said: “Whoever satirizes his father—the mere fact of his satirizing is sufficient (to show that he is not his son), for had he been his son he would not have satirized his father.” [1] He composed many fantastic books. One of them tells of

---

[1] *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 301. The text seems uncertain.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. i, p. 118.

the tricks of robbers; in this manner he taught evil people the methods of stealing. And among his books are those on the tithes of industry in which he depreciated the commodities of merchants. Among them also in his book on laws, which shows how dishonest men get hold of the treasures and money of the people. There is also his book about the Fatwa (religious decision), which is full of attacks by his preceptor, al-Naẓẓām, on the teachings of the Companions; also his books about prostitutes and rabies, and sodomy, and about the tricks of the avaricious. The contents of these books suit him, his trade and his family. He also has a book about the habits of animals, the contents of which he drew from Aristotle's book on animals, and to it he added what is mentioned by al-Madā'inī [1] regarding the knowledge of the Arabs, and their poems about the uses to which animals could be put. He filled the book with dialogues between dogs and roosters. To be engaged in such dialogues wastes time on that which is loathsome. And to whomever boasts about al-Jāḥiẓ, we commend the saying of the orthodox about him in the 163
words of the poet concerning him:

> “If the ugliness of the swine is doubled
> His ugliness would still be inferior to that of al-Jāḥiẓ,
> A man who is himself a substitute for hell,
> And a mote in the eye of everyone who looks at him.”

13. *Concerning the Shaḥḥāmīyah among them.* These are the followers of abū-Ya'ḳūb al-Shaḥḥām,[2] who was the preceptor of al-Jubbā'ī. His heresies resemble the heresies of al-Jubbā'ī, except that he considers it possible that there is one thing determined by two determiners. Al-Jubbā'ī and his son denied this. Some of the weak-minded imagined that the teaching of al-Shaḥḥām was similar to that of

---

[1] *Ibid.*, vol. i, p. 578.

[2] Horten, *ibid.*, p. 338.

this. We mean only that paradise and hell are everlasting in a general way.

Among the heresies of al-Jāḥiẓ there is also his view that Allah does not cause anyone to enter hell, but that hell attracts its people of itself by its very nature, and then holds on to them of itself forever. This would also compel the view that paradise attracts people to itself by its nature, and that Allah does not cause anyone to enter paradise. If one were to hold this view, the desire for Allah's rewards would cease, and the use of prayer would be gone. On the other hand, if he said that Allah caused those who should go to paradise to enter paradise, he would also have to say that he caused the people of hell to enter hell. Al-Ka'bī boasts about al-Jāḥiẓ, claiming that he was one of the sheikhs of the Mu'tazilah. He also boasts of his many literary works, and claims that he was a Kinānī of the banu-Kinānah, ibn-
162 Khuzaimah ibn-Mudrakah ibn-Ilyās ibn-Mudhar. It might be said to al-Ka'bī: "If he [al-Jāḥiẓ] was a Kinānī as you claim, why did he write the book, *The boasting of the Kaḥṭānīyah over the Kinānīyah and the rest of the 'Adnānīyah?* Moreover, if he was an Arab, then why did he write the book, *The Superiority of the Freedmen over the Arabs?* Moreover, he mentioned in his book called, *Concerning the Boasting of Ḳaḥṭān over 'Adnān,* a number of poems in which Kaḥṭān satirizes 'Adnān. And in truth the man who delights in the satires against his fathers is like the man who himself satirizes his father. In satirizing ibn-Bassām [1] who satirized his own father, Jaḥẓah [2] has rightly said: "Whoever satirizes his father—the mere fact of his satirizing is sufficient (to show that he is not his son), for had he been his son he would not have satirized his father." [1] He composed many fantastic books. One of them tells of

---

[1] *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 301. The text seems uncertain.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. i, p. 118.

the tricks of robbers; in this manner he taught evil people the methods of stealing. And among his books are those on the tithes of industry in which he depreciated the commodities of merchants. Among them also in his book on laws, which shows how dishonest men get hold of the treasures and money of the people. There is also his book about the Fatwa (religious decision), which is full of attacks by his preceptor, al-Naẓẓām, on the teachings of the Companions; also his books about prostitutes and rabies, and sodomy, and about the tricks of the avaricious. The contents of these books suit him, his trade and his family. He also has a book about the habits of animals, the contents of which he drew from Aristotle's book on animals, and to it he added what is mentioned by al-Madā'inī [1] regarding the knowledge of the Arabs, and their poems about the uses to which animals could be put. He filled the book with dialogues between dogs and roosters. To be engaged in such dialogues wastes time on that which is loathsome. And to whomever boasts about al-Jāḥiẓ, we commend the saying of the orthodox about him in the 163
words of the poet concerning him:

> "If the ugliness of the swine is doubled
> His ugliness would still be inferior to that of al-Jāḥiẓ,
> A man who is himself a substitute for hell,
> And a mote in the eye of everyone who looks at him."

13. *Concerning the Shaḥḥāmīyah among them.* These are the followers of abū-Ya'ḳūb al-Shaḥḥām,[2] who was the preceptor of al-Jubbā'ī. His heresies resemble the heresies of al-Jubbā'ī, except that he considers it possible that there is one thing determined by two determiners. Al-Jubbā'ī and his son denied this. Some of the weak-minded imagined that the teaching of al-Shaḥḥām was similar to that of

---

[1] *Ibid.*, vol. i, p. 578.

[2] Horten, *ibid.*, p. 338.

the Ṣifātīyah on this point. But there is a wide difference between the two views. Al-Shaḥḥām allowed the possibility of there being one thing determined by two determiners—each one of which two could produce the thing determined interchangeably. Al-Ka'bī reports this in his book entitled *'Uyūn al-Masā'il' ala abi-al-Hudhail.* But the Ṣifātīyah do not grant the possibility of two creators. When they do grant that there are two determiners for one thing determined, they do so in the sense that one of the two is its creator and the other the acquirer, and the creator is not the acquirer, nor the acquirer the creator. This gives the explanation of the difference between the two parties in the difference of their two methods of exposition.

14. *Concerning the Khaiyāṭīyah among them.* These are the followers of abū-al-Ḥusain al-Khaiyāṭ, who was the preceptor of al-Ka'bī in his heresy. Al-Khaiyāṭ agreed with the rest of the Ḳadarīyah in most of their heresies, except that he differed from them in saying on the non-existent what none had said before. For the Mu'tazilah disagreed about calling the non-existent an object. Some 164 of them say it is not true that the non-existent can be known, or described, nor that it is an object, nor a substance, nor an essence, nor a phenomenon. This was the opinion of al-Ṣāliḥī among them.[1] He agreed with the orthodox in not calling the non-existent an object. But others of the Mu'tazilah claimed that the non-existent is an object which can be known and described, but is not essence or phenomenon. This was al-Ka'bī's opinion. Al-Jubbā'ī and his son abū-Hāshim claimed that every attribute was rendered real, either for itself or for its genus, by the one that originated it, and that such attribute remained, existing even when (the object) is non-existent. He claimed further that an

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 305.

essence was an essence even when in a state of non-existence, that a phenomenon was a phenomenon even when in a state of non-existence, and that black was black, and white was white even when non-existent. All of these men, however, forbade calling the non-existent a body; the body, according to them, has become complex, and comes to be an agglomerate, having length and breadth and depth; it is impossible to describe something non-existent by something to which a bodily reality is attributed. From all the Mu'tazilah, as well as from the rest of the sects of the faithful, al-Khaiyāṭ differs on this subject. He claims that the body when non-existent is a body because it must be a body when it appears, but that it is not necessary for the non-existent to be in motion, because, according to him, a body when it appears is not necessarily in motion. He said: "Every attribute [or qualification] may become existent when [the thing described] makes its appearance"; therefore he holds it to be existent even in its state of non-existence. Such reasoning demands that man be man before he appears as such. This were possible if Allah could have brought him into existence in the form of man in all his completeness without having formed him in the loins and in the womb, and without at all changing him from one form to another. 165 The most advanced of these Khaiyāṭīyah are called al-Ma'dūmīyah because of their extreme views on ascribing to the non-existent most of the attributes of all existing things. This appellation stuck to them. In a separate book, al-Jubbā'ī broke with al-Khaiyāṭ over his view that the body was a body before its appearance. He makes the point that this view leads to the view of the pre-existence of bodies (as opposed to their being created). But the following conclusion is necessary on the part of al-Khaiyāṭ, al-Jubbā'ī and his son—namely, that essences and phenomena are essences and phenomena even in a state of nonthe Ṣifātīyah on this point. But there is a wide difference between the two views. Al-Shaḥḥām allowed the possibility of there being one thing determined by two determiners—each one of which two could produce the thing determined interchangeably. Al-Ka‘bī reports this in his book entitled *‘Uyūn al-Masā’il‘ ala abi-al-Hudhail.* But the Ṣifātīyah do not grant the possibility of two creators. When they do grant that there are two determiners for one thing determined, they do so in the sense that one of the two is its creator and the other the acquirer, and the creator is not the acquirer, nor the acquirer the creator. This gives the explanation of the difference between the two parties in the difference of their two methods of exposition.

14. *Concerning the Khaiyāṭīyah among them.* These are the followers of abū-al-Ḥusain al-Khaiyāṭ, who was the preceptor of al-Ka‘bī in his heresy. Al-Khaiyāṭ agreed with the rest of the Ḳadarīyah in most of their heresies, except that he differed from them in saying on the non-existent what none had said before. For the Mu‘tazilah disagreed about calling the non-existent an object. Some
164 of them say it is not true that the non-existent can be known, or described, nor that it is an object, nor a substance, nor an essence, nor a phenomenon. This was the opinion of al-Ṣāliḥī among them.[1] He agreed with the orthodox in not calling the non-existent an object. But others of the Mu‘tazilah claimed that the non-existent is an object which can be known and described, but is not essence or phenomenon. This was al-Ka‘bī's opinion. Al-Jubbā’ī and his son abū-Hāshim claimed that every attribute was rendered real, either for itself or for its genus, by the one that originated it, and that such attribute remained, existing even when (the object) is non-existent. He claimed further that an

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 305.

essence was an essence even when in a state of non-existence, that a phenomenon was a phenomenon even when in a state of non-existence, and that black was black, and white was white even when non-existent. All of these men, however, forbade calling the non-existent a body; the body, according to them, has become complex, and comes to be an agglomerate, having length and breadth and depth; it is impossible to describe something non-existent by something to which a bodily reality is attributed. From all the Mu‘tazilah, as well as from the rest of the sects of the faithful, al-Khaiyāṭ differs on this subject. He claims that the body when non-existent is a body because it must be a body when it appears, but that it is not necessary for the non-existent to be in motion, because, according to him, a body when it appears is not necessarily in motion. He said: " Every attribute [or qualification] may become existent when [the thing described] makes its appearance "; therefore he holds it to be existent even in its state of non-existence. Such reasoning demands that man be man before he appears as such. This were possible if Allah could have brought him into existence in the form of man in all his completeness without having formed him in the loins and in the womb, and without at all changing him from one form to another. 165
The most advanced of these Khaiyāṭīyah are called al-Ma‘dūmīyah because of their extreme views on ascribing to the non-existent most of the attributes of all existing things. This appellation stuck to them. In a separate book, al-Jubbā’ī broke with al-Khaiyāṭ over his view that the body was a body before its appearance. He makes the point that this view leads to the view of the pre-existence of bodies (as opposed to their being created). But the following conclusion is necessary on the part of al-Khaiyāṭ, al-Jubbā’ī and his son—namely, that essences and phenomena are essences and phenomena even in a state of non-

existence. If they now say that they are still objects, essences, and phenomena, whose appearance is dependent upon their being objects, they are still forced to regard them as eternal, and in reality hold the same view as do those who believe that essences and phenomena are pre-existent. Besides his heresy about Ḳadar and non-existence, al-Khaiyāṭ denied the value of traditions coming from a single authority. In doing this he practically denied most of the Sharī'ah laws, because most of the legal ordinances are based upon traditions going back to a single authority. Al-Ka'bī wrote a book against him on the evidence coming from tradition going back to a single person. In this book he condemns (?) [1] those who deny such evidence. We say to al-Ka'bī: "It is enough shame and disgrace for you to have been connected with a preceptor whose heresy you acknowledge."

15. *Concerning the Ka'bīyah among them.* These are the followers of abū-Ḳāsim 'Abdallāh ibn-Aḥmad ibn-Maḥmūd al-Banaḥī, known as al-Ka'bī. . . . (The text of the following sentence is not clear.) He was a gatherer of wood before he was introduced to various studies, both special and
166 general, and he did not acquire a deep knowledge of their secrets in any one department. In fact, he failed to grasp the superficial,—how much more, then, the kernel. He differed from the Baṣrīyūn among the Mu'tazilah over many points, for the Baṣrīyūn held that Allah sees his people in the body, and with colors; but they denied that he sees himself, just as they deny that others see him. Al-Ka'bī, on the other hand, claimed that Allah does not see himself, nor anyone else, except in the sense that he knows himself and others. He followed al-Naẓẓām in his view that Allah does not liter-

البنحي ؟
= البلخي

---

[1] The text at this point is clear, but the meaning is obviously contradictory.

ally see anything. Another thing over which he differed from the Baṣrīyūn and our followers is that they held that Allah literally hears word and sound, and not simply in the sense that he knows them. Al-Ka'bī and the Baghdādīyūn among the Mu'tazilah claimed that Allah hears nothing in the sense of perception known as sound. Moreover, they defined Allah's attribute as the hearer and the seer, in the sense that he had *knowledge* of the hearable which others heard and the seeable which others saw. Furthermore, some of them claim that the Baṣrīyūn among them, together with our followers, hold that Allah exercises will in the true sense of the word. But our followers say that he does not cease willing through an *eternal* will, while the Baṣrīyūn, among the Mu'tazilah, claim that he wills through his *temporal* will, unlimited by space. Al-Ka'bī and al-Naẓẓām, however, and their followers do not agree with these two views, for they claim that Allah has no actual will, and that when one says that Allah wills a thing which he performs, one means that he did this thing, and when one says that he of himself willed a deed, one means that he commanded it. According to both of these explanations, ascribing will to him is merely figurative, just as in the words of Allah: "The wall wills 167
to fall" (Surah 18, v. 76), the ascribing of will to a wall is merely figurative. For this denial of the will of Allah they together with our followers were condemned as heretics by the Baṣrīyūn. Another thing over which they disagreed was that al-Ka'bī claimed that he who is killed is not dead. But this does not agree with the word of Allah: "Every spirit must taste of death" (Surah 3, v. 186). The rest of the people agreed that all killed are dead, although they admit that a dead person is not necessarily killed. Another point of disagreement is that al-Ka'bī held the same views as those who make it compulsory on Allah to do the best thing, as a matter of necessity. Still other points of disagree-

ment were that both the Baṣrīyūn and our followers held that ability does not necessarily mean soundness of body and safety from disease. Al-Ka‘bī claims that it does. As for the Baṣrīyūn among the Mu‘tazilah, they condemn the Baghdādīyūn among them, while the latter in their turn condemn the former. As a matter of fact, each party is justified in condemning the other, as we explained in the book entitled, *Heresies of the Ḳadarīyah.*

16. *Concerning the Jubbā'īyah among them.* These are the followers of abū-‘Alī al-Jubbā'ī[1] who led astray the people of Khūzistān. The Mu‘tazilah of Baṣrah at that time belonged to his school, but afterwards joined the school of his son abū-Hāshim. Among the heresies of al-Jubbā'ī was the one in which he said that Allah is obedient to his servant if he does what his servant wills. The reason for this was that one day he said to our sheikh abū-l-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī, "According to you, what does obedience mean?" 168 The sheikh answered, "Agreement to a command," and then asked for his opinion in this matter. Al-Jubbā'ī said: "The essence of obedience, according to me, is agreement to the will. And whoever fulfils the will of another obeys him" [*i. e.* the other]. Our sheikh abū-l-Ḥasan answered: "According to this, one must conclude that Allah is obedient to his servant if he [Allah] fulfils his will" [*i. e.* the servant's will]. He granted this. Then our sheikh said: "You differ from the community of Moslems and you blaspheme the Lord of the Worlds. For if Allah is obedient to his servant, then he must be subject to him. Allah is far and away above being this. Al-Jubbā'ī furthermore claimed that the names of Allah are subject to the regular rules of grammar; he therefore considered it possible to derive a name for him [Allah] from every deed which he performs.

---

[1] Horten, *ibid.*, p. 352.

Our sheikh abū-l-Ḥasan said, that according to this view Allah should be named "the producer of pregnancy among women," because he creates the pregnancy in them. Al-Jubbā'ī could not escape this conclusion. Our sheikh said: "This heresy of yours is worse than the heresy of the Christians in calling Allah the father of Jesus, although even they do not hold that he produced pregnancy in Mary."

Among the heresies of al-Jubbā'ī was also the one, according to which he considered it possible for one phenomenon to be in many places even in more than a thousand thousand places. Thus he considered it possible for one word to be in a thousand thousand places, and he claimed that when a word written in one place is then written in another, it exists in two places, without passing from the first place to the second, and without making its appearance in the second. It is thus the same whether it is written in a thousand places, or in a thousand thousand places. He and his son abū-al-Hāshim claimed that Allah, when he desires to destroy the world, creates a spaceless phenomenon by means of which he destroys all bodies and essences. But it is not within the power of Allah to destroy some essences and to spare others. Though he created them separately, he 169 is not able to destroy them separately. It is reported that our sheikh said to al-Jubbā'ī: "If you say that Allah wishes all that he decrees, then what do you say of a man to whom a debt is owed, and the payment is constantly being put off, and the debtor says, 'Verily I will pay you the debt tomorrow, if Allah wishes,' and then does not pay his debt the next day?" He answered that such a man violated his oath, because Allah desires him to pay the debt then. Our sheikh said to him: "You differ from the community of the Moslems who preceded you, for they agreed before you that he who binds his oath to the *will* of Allah does not violate it if he does not keep his oath."

ment were that both the Baṣrīyūn and our followers held that ability does not necessarily mean soundness of body and safety from disease. Al-Ka'bī claims that it does. As for the Baṣrīyūn among the Mu'tazilah, they condemn the Baghdādīyūn among them, while the latter in their turn condemn the former. As a matter of fact, each party is justified in condemning the other, as we explained in the book entitled, *Heresies of the Ḳadarīyah.*

16. *Concerning the Jubbā'īyah among them.* These are the followers of abū-'Alī al-Jubbā'ī[1] who led astray the people of Khūzistān. The Mu'tazilah of Baṣrah at that time belonged to his school, but afterwards joined the school of his son abū-Hāshim. Among the heresies of al-Jubbā'ī was the one in which he said that Allah is obedient to his servant if he does what his servant wills. The reason for this was that one day he said to our sheikh abū-l-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī, "According to you, what does obedience mean?"
168 The sheikh answered, "Agreement to a command," and then asked for his opinion in this matter. Al-Jubbā'ī said: "The essence of obedience, according to me, is agreement to the will. And whoever fulfils the will of another obeys him" [*i. e.* the other]. Our sheikh abū-l-Ḥasan answered: "According to this, one must conclude that Allah is obedient to his servant if he [Allah] fulfils his will" [*i. e.* the servant's will]. He granted this. Then our sheikh said: "You differ from the community of Moslems and you blaspheme the Lord of the Worlds. For if Allah is obedient to his servant, then he must be subject to him. Allah is far and away above being this. Al-Jubbā'ī furthermore claimed that the names of Allah are subject to the regular rules of grammar; he therefore considered it possible to derive a name for him [Allah] from every deed which he performs.

---

[1] Horten, *ibid.*, p. 352.

Our sheikh abū-l-Ḥasan said, that according to this view Allah should be named "the producer of pregnancy among women," because he creates the pregnancy in them. Al-Jubbā'ī could not escape this conclusion. Our sheikh said: "This heresy of yours is worse than the heresy of the Christians in calling Allah the father of Jesus, although even they do not hold that he produced pregnancy in Mary."

Among the heresies of al-Jubbā'ī was also the one, according to which he considered it possible for one phenomenon to be in many places even in more than a thousand thousand places. Thus he considered it possible for one word to be in a thousand thousand places, and he claimed that when a word written in one place is then written in another, it exists in two places, without passing from the first place to the second, and without making its appearance in the second. It is thus the same whether it is written in a thousand places, or in a thousand thousand places. He and his son abū-al-Hāshim claimed that Allah, when he desires to destroy the world, creates a spaceless phenomenon by means of which he destroys all bodies and essences. But it is not within the power of Allah to destroy some essences and to spare others. Though he created them separately, he 169
is not able to destroy them separately. It is reported that our sheikh said to al-Jubbā'ī: "If you say that Allah wishes all that he decrees, then what do you say of a man to whom a debt is owed, and the payment is constantly being put off, and the debtor says, 'Verily I will pay you the debt tomorrow, if Allah wishes,' and then does not pay his debt the next day?" He answered that such a man violated his oath, because Allah desires him to pay the debt then. Our sheikh said to him: "You differ from the community of the Moslems who preceded you, for they agreed before you that he who binds his oath to the *will* of Allah does not violate it if he does not keep his oath."

17. *Concerning the Bahshamīyah.* These are the followers of abū-Ḥāshim and of al-Jubbā'ī, and most of the Mu‘tazilah of our age hold the same view regarding the claims he made on ibn-‘Abbād, the vizier of the Buwaihids. They were called al-Dhimmīyah because of their view concerning the deserving of blame, even though the deed is not performed. They shared in most of the heresies of the Mu‘tazilah, though they also distinguished themselves from them in special heresies which they were the first to hold. Among others, was their view about the deserving of blame and punishment when a deed had not been performed. Thus verily they claimed that the one who is able to do a thing [desiring to do it], may not do it, and yet commit infidelity, in spite of the fact that there is no hindrance to the deed. This assertion of theirs is due to the fact that our followers said to the Mu‘tazilah, if you declare it possible that ability precede the deed, it necessarily follows that two times and the many times are equal, because the one precedes the other. They came to differ over the answer to the conclusion, some saying that the occurrence of the deed
170 or its non-occurrence is possible, while ability is passing from the state of possibility to that of actuality. He had to conclude that the occurrence of the deed or its non-occurrence is possible when no hindrance exists. In addition to this, it was claimed that ability does not mean ability to perform the deed at the moment of occurrence; one of them granted that ability might be non-existent just as the occurrence of the deed was non-existent at the very time when inability occurred, which is the very opposite of ability which has vanished after having existed. Abū-Hāshim ibn-al-Jubbā'ī saw the necessity of accepting the conclusion forced on him by our companions, to wit: equality between the two times and the many, in that he held it possible that ability should precede the deed. It was impossible for the

Mu‘tazilites to come to a real conclusion and he had to find some way out. Ḥe considered it possible for the man with ability to last forever together with the continuance of his power—the Koran verse fitting his case and all hindrances being removed with regard to it, in so far as concerns the doing of the deed and its abandonment. Concerning this it was said to him: "Can you see what is the condition of the man who possesses ability and has moral responsibility, but dies before he has performed an act of obedience or disobedience by his ability?" He answered: "He deserves blame and the punishment of eternity, not because of his deeds, but because he has not done that which he was commanded to do, although he had the ability and had no hindrances." It was said to him: "How does he deserve punishment for not doing what he was commanded, and not doing what he was forbidden to do, and not deserving a reward because he did not do what he was forbidden to do, even if he does not do what he was commanded?"

There were some of his predecessors among the Mu‘tazilah who used to condemn him who says that Allah punishes the disobedient because of the commission of a sin, which the sinner did not himself originate. They, however, 171
now said: "It is preferable to condemn abū-Hāshim for his views on the punishment of one who was not disobedient, either for his own deed or for that of some one else." Furthermore, he should be condemned for calling the person who did not do what he was commanded disobedient, even though that person did not commit a disobedience, thus applying the name of obedient only to him who actually obeys the command. If it is possible to have a disobedient person without having actual disobedience, then it is possible to have an obedient person without actual obedience, or an unbeliever without actual unbelief. Moreover, besides these hateful heresies, he claimed that if

this morally responsible man did a wrong thing, he would, in this case, deserve a double portion of the punishment. One part for the hateful thing which he did, and the other because he did not perform the beautiful thing which was commanded him. If he does the right thing and performs the deeds of the prophet, and Allah commands him to do a thing which he does not do, nor does he do the opposite, then indeed he becomes immortal. The rest of the Mu'tazilah condemned him for the three following propositions. First, his statement that punishment is deserved, even when not due to the actual deed. Secondly, his claim that a double portion of the punishment is deserved, when a wrong thing is committed (for doing what is wrong, and for not doing what is right). And thirdly, his view that if he does the right thing, and is obedient just as were the prophets, and yet fails to do one thing which Allah commanded him, but at the same time does not do its opposite, in that case he does not deserve eternal fire in hell.

About his view of the double portion of punishment, our companions said that there must, according to this, be two punishments; for example, in the case of adultery, one punishment is for adultery which is committed, and the second because he failed to do that which was incumbent on him, *i. e.*, avoiding adultery. The same view holds regarding blasphemy, punishment, and drinking of wine. 172 They said that it also necessarily follows that two atonements are incumbent upon him who breaks the fast in the month of Ramaḍān, one for a breaking of the fast, which necessitates atonement, and the other because he did not do that which was incumbent on him, *i. e.*, fasting and withholding from food. When ibn-al-Jubbā'ī saw the trend that his conclusion was taking against him, because of these heresies of his, he committed something still more hateful than these heresies, in order to escape the necessity of two

punishments and two atonements in connection with one deed. So he said: "He simply forbade adultery and drinking and blasphemy. But as for the avoiding of these deeds, it is not compulsory for man." Furthermore, they said that he must conclude that there are three punishments and more *ad infinitum*, because he asserted that there are two punishments for that which is committed by man, one because he did not commit the act, and one because he did not commit its cause. According to him, we may find causes produced by many preceding causes. For example, take the hitting of the target with an arrow, this is produced by many motions accomplished by the throwing of the arrow. Everyone of these motions is a cause for that which follows until the actual hitting of the target takes place. If there were a hundred motions, the hundredth of them would be the cause of the hitting. One should therefore conclude that if Allah commanded a man to hit, and he does not do so, he deserves a hundred punishments and one more, the latter because he did not make the hit, and the hundred because he did not make the necessary motions. One must also conclude that if a man was commanded to speak, and did not do so, he deserves two punishments, one because he did not say the word, and one because he did not produce its cause; but if he performed something opposite to the cause of the word, he does not deserve both punishments, for this would take the place of the cause which he did not produce. We said to him: "Would one deserve three punishments, one because he does not say the word, another because he does not produce its cause, and a third because of the performance of the opposite of the cause of the word?" Some 173 of our companions report of him that he did not assert that there were two punishments except in the case of his not having produced the cause of speaking a word. But he had pointed out the opposite view in his book *Istiḥḳāḳ al-Dhim-*

mah (The Demanding of Protection). In this he said that every thing that could have a special neglect is in the same category as the cause of a spoken word. But those things which cannot have special neglect are in the same category as the neglecting of giving an obligatory gift, such as alms, and atonement, as the payment of a debt and the return of unlawful possessions. What he meant was that alms and atonement and the like are not performed by a special organ and that there is not a special organ of neglect in connection with each one. For if a man prays or goes on the pilgrimage, or does other things of the kind, it will occasion a neglect of alms. As to speaking a word, the cause for its neglect must be special, and therefore to neglect it is hateful. Therefore, if he neglect the cause of speaking a word, he deserves one portion of punishment. But in the matter of giving there is no hateful neglect. Therefore, one who does not give does not deserve another portion of punishment in addition to the blame he deserves. And so they said to him: "If the neglect of prayer and alms is not hateful, then it must be beautiful." Such a view is a departure from religion and all that is connected iwth it. Among the inconsistencies he committed in this chapter is the fact that he called him who did not do what he ought a wrongdoer, even though he were not actually doing wrong. He thus called him unbeliever and heretic, but hesitated to call him disobedient. He thus considered it possible for Allah to consign a man to fire forever, even though he did not deserve the appellation of disobedient. But if he called him unbeliever and heretic, he must call him disobedient; whereas, if he refrains from calling him disobedient he should not call him heretic and unbeliever. Another inconsistency is his disagreement with the consensus of opinion by making distinction between
174 recompense and reward, according to which he said: "It follows that there may be much reward in heaven which is

not recompense, and that in hell there may be much retribution that is not recompense. He refused to call it recompense, because recompense is only for an act, and according to him there may be punishment without there having been any act. It might well be said of him: "Since there can be no recompense save for an act, then why do you deny that there is no reward and retribution except for an act?"

Abū-Hāshim's second heresy was his view that one could deserve blame and praise for the act of another. For example, if Zaid commands 'Amr to give something to someone else, and he does so, he deserves thanks from the recipient of the gift for the act which was really due to the act of someone else. In the same way if he commanded him a sin, and he committed it, he does not himself deserve the blame for the sin which is due to the act of another. This view of his is not like the view of the rest of the community, in that he claims that one deserves thanks or blame according to the command given, not according to the act commanded him, and which was done for another. This view forced him to say that there was double praise and double blame, one of them for the command which is performed, and the other for the thing commanded, which is in reality the act of another. How can this view of his be true, when he denies the truth of what those say who live for gain, *i. e.* to the effect that Allah created the gains of his servants, and then either rewards or punishes them for it. It might be said to him: "What you deny on this basis, which is the act of another, separates you from the view of the Azāriḳah that Allah torments the child of the polytheist for the deed of his fathers." Furthermore, it might be said:
"If you conclude this, then you must conclude that man 175
deserves praise and reward for a deed done by Allah in conjunction with the deed of man, *e. g.* a man who is on

his deathbed, is given food and drink, and as a result lives and breathes again, according to this conclusion he deserves praise and reward for his own life and for the satisfaction of his hunger and thirst, which, after all, is really an act of Allah.

His third heresy is his view that repentance is not accepted as long as the sinner adheres to some other evil thing which he knows is evil or which he believes to be evil, even if it is good in itself. He also claims that repentance of heresy cannot be accepted if the sinner still persists in withholding the smallest item due by him. In support of his assertion he gave the following illustration, that he who kills another man's son and commits adultery with the latter's wife, his repentance for one of the sins may be accepted even if he persists in the other. But such an example can not be admitted as illustration. The acceptance of his repentance (for the one sin) is all right, if he is punished for the other, just as in the case of the son who is ungrateful to his father the Imām, steals from various persons, and commits adultery with his maids, then asks forgiveness of the father for the ungratefulness, and the repentance of his ungratefulness is accepted for the money he stole from him (his father), but his hand is cut off for the rest of the property (stolen), and he is flogged for the adultery. For his proof in this case he asserted that the only necessity for his forsaking what was evil was the fact of its being evil; but if he persisted in some other evil, it would show that the reason for his forsaking the first was not simply because it was evil. We say to him: "That which you deny is the abandoning of evil in order to escape retribution." Is it possible for a man to escape retribution for the sin of which he repents, and at the same time be punished for the sin of which he does not repent? Here is what we said further to him: "The essence of what is in

this chapter, is that he who repents of some of his sins, renouncing and repenting these sins because they are vile, but still persists in some other vile sin; why is this one's repentance not accepted on what he repented; as in the case of the Khawārij and others who have held corrupt beliefs considered good by them, and whose repentance you accept with regard to some evil they know to be evil, even when it is connected with persistence in some other evil which they had believed was good? According to this you must conclude that if you say that he is commanded to avoid everything which he believes is evil, then you say of the man among us who believes in the evil of the school of abū-Hāshim, and commits adultery and theft, that his repentance cannot be accepted except by his forsaking everything which he believes is evil. He is then commanded to avoid adultery and theft, and to avoid the school of abū-Hāshim, because of his belief in their evil." Our followers asked him about a Jew who becomes a Moslem and repents of all evil except that he persists in keeping a small piece of silver away from the one who justly deserved it, although he knows such an act is illegal; in such a case is the man's repentance of heresy to be accepted? If he said yes to this, he would be breaking down his own excuse, and if he said no he would be opposing the whole of the community, both because of his view that his Islamism was not true, and because he was heretical about his Judaism which he had held before his repentance; lastly, because the regulations of the Jews are not binding on him. He claimed, therefore, that he did not repent of his Judaism, but persisted in it, but is nevertheless no Jew. This is very evidently contradictory, and it might be said to him that if the man persisted in his Judaism, then you should recognize his sacrifice as legal and take tax from him. This view differs from that of the community.

His fourth heresy is his view that repentance from sin 177 after inability to sin is not acceptable. Nor, according to him, is repentance for lying acceptable when the tongue becomes unable to speak, nor repentance for adultery when the man is a eunuch. This is contradictory to the view of all of the community before him. It might be said to him: "Do you believe that a man who has a tongue and tells a lie, who can and does commit adultery, is a sinner?" And if he says yes, then it can be said: "In like manner, he must believe that if one can lie and commit adultery and yet does not disobey Allah, then obedience and repentance are necessarily present." With his excesses in threats, abū-Hāshim was the most dissolute of the men of his time. He was also given to drinking wine. And it was said that he died when drunk, so that some Murji'ite said:

> "He says shameful things about the Murji'ah until
> He sees some hope in the sins,
> And the greatest sinner among the people are the Murji'ah
> And my servant persisted in the major sins (?)"

His fifth heresy was his view on the conditioned will. The chief point in this is his view that it is not possible for one thing to be desired from one standpoint and abominated from another. What forced him to this is that he spoke against him who believes in different standpoints regarding acquisition and creation; he said that the standpoint of acquisition is necessarily either real or unreal. If the stand- 178 point is unreal, we should have proof of the existence of a thing that is both real and unreal. If it is real, it is necessarily either created or non-created. If it is created, it proves that it is created from all standpoints, while if it is not created, the mind becomes eternal (non-created) from one standpoint and created from another, which is an impossibility. He was led to this view by his thought that a thing must be desired from one standpoint and abominated from another.

It may be said to him: "Then will, according to you, is not related to a thing, except from the standpoint of its occurrence, which is also an abomination. And if a thing is willed from one standpoint, and abominated from another, it follows that the one who wills has willed what he wills and abominated what he wills, which is a contradiction." But he said: "The one willing, wills nothing except from all standpoints, so that it is not possible for him to abominate it from another standpoint." This view is necessarily followed by the question of the known and the unknown, since he does not deny that a thing can be known from one standpoint and unknown from the other, by committing himself to the view that the same thing cannot be willed from one standpoint and abominated from another, he laid himself open to problems which destroy the basis of the Mu'tazilah creed. In fact, he had committed himself to most of these, and thus had to conclude that among the greatest heresies there were some that Allah did not abominate, and, on the other hand, among the beautiful truths, there were some that Allah did not will. The explanation of this is that if to kneel before Allah is worship . . . (?), . . . of idols, although to kneel before an idol is a great evil. And thus 179 if he should wish that his description of Muḥammad as the prophet of Allah should refer to ibn-'Abdallāh, it would be necessary for him not to dislike it to be a description of another Muḥammad, although this is heresy. It also follows that if Allah hates to have kneeling used as a worship of idols, then he does not wish it to be a worship of Allah, even though (in such a case) it be the worship of Allah and beautiful obedience. To all this, he committed himself, and moreover he mentioned in his great Collection that kneeling to idols is not abominated by Allah; at the same time he rejected the fact that the same thing could be willed and abominated from two different standpoints.

This view he said abū-'Alī, his father, considered to be right. According to me, this view is not based upon proper principles, for will has nothing to do with the thing, except in the matter of occurrence, according to us and to him. If he wills the occurrence of a thing, and at the same time abominates it, it follows that what he abominates is what he wills, unless there were two occurrences of the thing. According to us, he who relies on him is wrong because we hold that will has to do with the willed from the standpoint of occurrence, as well as from other standpoints. This conclusion which is forced on him is not forced on his father, and for forcing this conclusion there is an *answer* and a *reversal*. As to the answer, his father in his view does not mean that will has to do with the thing from the standpoint of occurrence, as abū-Hāshim held; in reality the father meant that the will is related to the thing while it was occurring, or to an attribute which it has while occurring; such as willing an act and willing that it should be an act of obedience to Allah, this (obedience) being an attribute that develops at the time of the occurrence. This resembles the view that command and report are not command and report except through the will, either the will of the one commanding, according to abū-Hāshim and others, or its inherent
180 will to be a command and a report, as ibn-al-Ikhshīd among them said, because Allah had said, "And let him then who will, believe" (Surah 18, v. 28). He has, therefore, willed the occurrence of his word, as well as the belief from them, but the words, "Let him believe," is not, in this case, a command; rather is it a threat, because he did not will this word to be a command. The report, according to them, is not a report until he wills it to be a report about this man and not that man. Although this is the reason for the willing of the occurrence of a thing, and although it has been proved that Allah's dislike of having kneeling made a worship of idols is different from his will about its occurrence, yet what abū-Hāshim said about its being willed from the standpoint which he abominated, does not follow. And as for the *reversal*, it is said Allah forbids kneeling to idols, and has given a command about it, and it has been firmly held by the Mu'tazilah that Allah commanded only the occurrence of the thing, and also forbids only its occurrence. Moreover, as they have held that Allah commanded kneeling as an act of worship to him, it must therefore follow that he forbids something from the standpoint which he commanded; for he forbids only the occurrence of the thing, and kneeling is only one occurrence. If, however, it had two occurrences, it would be necessary for it to be created from one standpoint and uncreated from another, whereupon the same conclusion about commanding and forbidding is forced upon him which was forced upon his father and the merchants(?) with regard to willing and abominating.

His sixth heresy is his view regarding "the status" 181
(*Aḥwāl*), which view was considered heretic by his fellow Mu'tazilites, as well as the other sects. What forced him to this heresy was the question put by our followers, the old Mu'tazilites, as to whether the learned among us differs from the ignorant by his knowledge in himself or for some other reason. They rejected the view that he differed from him in himself because both are of one kind. It is impossible that his difference with himself should be neither because of himself nor for some other reason, because then, in differing from himself, he would not be superior to anyone else. It necessarily follows, too, that Allah has in his difference from the ignorant a significance (*ma'na*) or an attribute by which he is differentiated. He thus claims that Allah differs from the ignorant only for being in a special state (*ḥāl*). Therefore the state exists in three situations. The first is the one in which the subject (*mauṣūf*) itself

receives the attribute and deserves the attribute because of the state in which it is.

The second situation is that the subject to which an attribute is given becomes attached to that attribute as its state (*ḥāl*).

The third situation is that the subject deserves an attribute neither for itself nor for an attribute, and becomes attached to that quality rather than anything else attached to the subject as its state.

What forced him into this was a question put by Mu'ammar regarding "the significances": "Did the learning of Zaid belong to him rather than 'Amr, for himself or for some significance, or neither for himself nor some significance?" If it is for himself, then it follows that all branches of learning belong to him, for they are all learning. If it is for some significance, then Mu'ammar is right in holding that each significance is attached to another significance endlessly. If it is neither for himself nor for some significance, then the fact that it belongs to him or to some one else is immaterial. According to abū-Hāshim, Zaid's learning belongs to him for some state (*ḥāl*). But our followers say that his learning belongs to him by its essence, and neither because it was knowledge nor because it was Zaid; 182 which is like saying that black is black because of its essence and not because it has a self or a being. They then said to abū-Hāshim, "Do you know the status or not?" And he said no, because if he had said that they were known, he would have had to prove that they were objects, because, according to him, nothing is known unless it is an object. Nor could he say that they were changing status, because changes occur only in the case of objects and substances. Moreover, he does not say that status exist, nor does he say that they are non-existent, nor that they are eternal, nor that they are created, nor that they are known, nor that

they are unknown, nor does he say that they are mentioned, although he mentioned them, holding that they are unmentioned, which is a contradiction.

He claimed, moreover, that the learned has in each known thing a condition which cannot be said to be his condition in another known thing. To this end, he claimed that the conditions of the creator as to what he knows are endless; the same thing being true about his conditions in his own capabilities, that they are endless just as his capabilities are endless. Our companions say to him: "You did not deny that for one known thing there are endless conditions, for the known can be dependent on any existent knower *ad infinitum*. Furthermore, are the conditions of the creator brought about by others, or are they he himself?" To this he answered, "They are neither he nor another." They then said to him, "Why do you deny the view of the Ṣifātīyah that the attributes of Allah are endless, since they are neither he nor another?"[1]

---

[1] In the sixth of his heresies Abū-Hāshim addresses himself to the problem of absolute being, human and divine and raises the question as to how the essence of this being differentiates itself from another being of the same genus or of another class and kind. Does a philosopher differ from a fool, the learned from the ignorant, by what the philosopher or the learned know, or in essence through some other causes. These early Arab enquirers, the old Mu'tazilah, held that it was not in essence or in some quality of the essence; for both belong to the same genus. (For what is the wise man more than the fool?)

These twain differ not in essence nor in the phenomena, the accidents nor the acquirements of life—a Semitic view as old as the Preacher of Ecclesiastes—and the difference, what ever source it is from does not make the one superior to another. But Allah, al-'Ālim, the knowing, in what fashion does he differ from the ignorant, in what sense and in what attribute does he differ? Abū-Hāshim asserts that God differed solely in essence and not otherwise, and this essence differs in ways, or phases or particulars.

The point of these aspects is that it is true of the divine essence that it is as it is and can be no other, and as it is in and by itself described and defined, and its conditioning nature is its inevitable and natural condition so that no other is or can be like it.

His seventh heresy is the denial of certain phenomena [accidentals], the existence of which has been established
183 by almost everyone, such as continuance, perception, grief,
pain, and doubt. He claims that pain which has been inflicted on man by an accident, and pain which comes from drinking distasteful medicines, does not mean more than the perception of something which temperament shuns; therefore perception, according to him, is not a reality. The same is true of the perception of the substances of people condemned to fire while they are in fire. In the same way, according to him, pleasures are not realities, they are not more than perceptions of a desired thing, and perception is not a reality. Of the pain which comes from the plague, he said it is a reality like that which comes from a blow. For proof of this he gave the view that it was included under sensation, which is a strange view, because the pain due to a blow with a stick, and the pain from mustard medicine, and the sting that comes from fire and from the drinking of bitter herbs are the same as regards sensation. Moreover, if he rejects the existence of pleasures as a reality, he cannot then consider the pleasures of the people of heaven more than the pleasures of infants which are given to them for well-doing, for nothing cannot be more than nothing. But he claimed that pleasure in itself is a benefit and a sensation, and yet he asserted that benefit and sensation are nothing. Moreover, he claims that all pain is harm, from which it follows that according to him harm also is nothing.

His eighth heresy is his view in his chapter on annihilation, to the effect that Allah has no power to annihilate an atom from the world and still preserve the integrity of heaven and earth. This claim he founded on the basis of his assertion that bodies cannot be annihilated except by an annihilation created by Allah in no particular place and one that is opposed to all existing things because it is not peculiar to some of the substances, exclusive of others, since it
does not pertain to any of them. If it is opposed to them, 184
it annihilates them all. Regarding this heresy, it is sufficient to note that he says that Allah was able to annihilate a whole, but was not able to annihilate a part.

His ninth heresy is his view that ablution is not a necessity. What drove him to this was that he asked himself about ablutions with water illegally acquired (his view and that of his father being that prayer is illegal if performed on ground illegally acquired). He came to the conclusion about ablutions with water illegally acquired; (his view and able. The distinction he made between the latter and prayer performed in a house illegally acquired, was that ablutions are not necessary. Thus, although Allah commands his followers to pray only after ablutions, this man inferred that ablutions are not a necessity, because one may perform the ablutions for another, and it will be acceptable. He then carried this reasoning into the matter of the pilgrimage, claiming that standing and going [around the Ka'bah] and running are not necessary to the pilgrimage, because he can acquit himself of all duties when riding. According to this view, he must hold the required alms not obligatory, as well as the atonement, and vows, and the payment of debts, because these can be done by proxy. Yet these are the most important regulations of the religious law. It becomes evident by what we have mentioned in this chapter that the leaders of the Mu'tazilah condemned each other as heretics. Most of them also condemned their followers who imitated them. So to them we can apply the following saying of Allah: " We have aroused enmity and hatred among them " (Surah 5, v. 15). The following applies to the relation of their followers to them: " When those who have had followers shall declare themselves free from their followers, after that they have seen

the chastisement, and when the ties between them shall be
185 cut asunder" (Surah 2, v. 167). And further: "The followers shall say, 'Could we but return to life, we would keep ourselves clear from them, as they have declared themselves clear of us'" (Surah 5, v. 168).

Among the obstinacies of their leaders is that of al-Naẓẓām regarding the "leap" and his view that the body passes from the first place to the third or the tenth, without need of a medium. We find here also the obstinacies of that class of perjurers who assert that the dead really kill those who are alive. We also find the obstinacies of many of them in which they assert that he who is able to arise above the earth one span has also the power to rise above the seven heavens, and that those who have chained and bound hands are able to scale the steeps of the heavens, and that a small bug is able to drink the whole bottle (?).

Another of them, known as Ḳāsim al-Dimashḳī claims that letters of truth may form an untruth, and that the letters which are in the creed, "there is no God but Allah," are the same as those used in saying that Christ is a God; also that the letters which are in the Koran are the same as those in the book of Zoroaster of the Magians, being actually the same and not simply alike in one sense. He who does not consider such views as these mental arrogance, cannot consider the denial of the tangible by the Sophists an arrogance.

The Aṣḥāb al-Maḳālāt (the writers of sayings) report that seven of the leaders of the Ḳadarīyah gathered together in a meeting and talked of Allah's power to oppress and lie. When they separated, each one was condemning the other. One of them said to al-Naẓẓām in this meeting: "Has Allah [sufficient] power over what
186 comes forth from him to turn it into oppression and lying?"
He replied: "If he has such power, we cannot tell whether

he has oppressed or has lied in what has already come to pass, or whether he may oppress or lie in the future, or may even have oppressed in some parts of the earth [and not others]. The only security we have against his oppression and his lying is by our having a good opinion of him." The questioner went on: "What evidence then makes us secure from such behaviour on his [Allah's] part; but to find this out there is no way. To this 'Alī al-Aswārī answered: "According to this reasoning of yours it necessarily follows that Allah has no power over what he knows he does not do, or over what he said he would not do, because if he had power over it, he might have brought it about [after all] in the past or he may cause it in the future." Al-Naẓẓām said: "This does necessarily follow,—what, then, is your view of it?" He replied: "I compromise between the two views, and say that Allah has no power over what he knows he will not do, or over what he said he would not do, just as you and I say that he has no power to oppress and lie." Al-Naẓẓām then said to al-Aswārī: "Your view is apostate and heretical." Abū-al-Hudhail said to al-Aswārī: "What do you say of Pharaoh, and of those whom Allah knew would not believe,—were they able to believe or not? If you claim that they were not able to believe, then Allah would have laid upon them what they were unable to bear, and this, according to you, is heretical. On the other hand, if you say that they were able to believe, then how do you escape the fact that things occurred through them, which Allah knew would not occur, or that he said would not occur. According to your reasoning and that of al-Naẓẓām this is a denial similar to denying Allah's power to oppress and lie." He replied to abū-al-Hudhail: "Since this necessarily follows, how would you answer it?" And he replied: "My view is that Allah has power to oppress and to lie, and to do what he knows he would not do." And both of them said to him:

the chastisement, and when the ties between them shall be
185 cut asunder" (Surah 2, v. 167). And further: "The followers shall say, 'Could we but return to life, we would keep ourselves clear from them, as they have declared themselves clear of us'" (Surah 5, v. 168).

Among the obstinacies of their leaders is that of al-Naẓẓām regarding the "leap" and his view that the body passes from the first place to the third or the tenth, without need of a medium. We find here also the obstinacies of that class of perjurers who assert that the dead really kill those who are alive. We also find the obstinacies of many of them in which they assert that he who is able to arise above the earth one span has also the power to rise above the seven heavens, and that those who have chained and bound hands are able to scale the steeps of the heavens, and that a small bug is able to drink the whole bottle (?).

Another of them, known as Ḳāsim al-Dimashḳī claims that letters of truth may form an untruth, and that the letters which are in the creed, "there is no God but Allah," are the same as those used in saying that Christ is a God; also that the letters which are in the Koran are the same as those in the book of Zoroaster of the Magians, being actually the same and not simply alike in one sense. He who does not consider such views as these mental arrogance, cannot consider the denial of the tangible by the Sophists an arrogance.

The Aṣḥāb al-Maḳālāt (the writers of sayings) report that seven of the leaders of the Ḳadarīyah gathered together in a meeting and talked of Allah's power to oppress and lie. When they separated, each one was condemning the other. One of them said to al-Naẓẓām in this meeting: "Has Allah [sufficient] power over what
186 comes forth from him to turn it into oppression and lying?" He replied: "If he has such power, we cannot tell whether

he has oppressed or has lied in what has already come to pass, or whether he may oppress or lie in the future, or may even have oppressed in some parts of the earth [and not others]. The only security we have against his oppression and his lying is by our having a good opinion of him." The questioner went on: "What evidence then makes us secure from such behaviour on his [Allah's] part; but to find this out there is no way. To this 'Alī al-Aswārī answered: "According to this reasoning of yours it necessarily follows that Allah has no power over what he knows he does not do, or over what he said he would not do, because if he had power over it, he might have brought it about [after all] in the past or he may cause it in the future." Al-Naẓẓām said: "This does necessarily follow,—what, then, is your view of it?" He replied: "I compromise between the two views, and say that Allah has no power over what he knows he will not do, or over what he said he would not do, just as you and I say that he has no power to oppress and lie." Al-Naẓẓām then said to al-Aswārī: "Your view is apostate and heretical." Abū-al-Hudhail said to al-Aswārī: "What do you say of Pharaoh, and of those whom Allah knew would not believe,—were they able to believe or not? If you claim that they were not able to believe, then Allah would have laid upon them what they were unable to bear, and this, according to you, is heretical. On the other hand, if you say that they were able to believe, then how do you escape the fact that things occurred through them, which Allah knew would not occur, or that he said would not occur. According to your reasoning and that of al-Naẓẓām this is a denial similar to denying Allah's power to oppress and lie." He replied to abū-al-Hudhail: "Since this necessarily follows, how would you answer it?" And he replied: "My view is that Allah has power to oppress and to lie, and to do what he knows he would not do." And both of them said to him:

187 "If he oppresses and lies, do you see what is to be made of the principles of the essence of the evidence which tries to prove that Allah does not oppress or lie?" He replied: "This is impossible." Whereupon they both said to him: "How can the impossible be within the power of Allah, and why did you consider it impossible for such a thing to occur from him, if you consider it within his power?" His reply was: "Because it does not occur until misfortune comes to one, and it is impossible for misfortune to come upon Allah." They said to him: "It is also impossible for him to have power over what takes place through him, except when misfortune comes upon him." And the three were amazed. Bishr said to them that everything which they held was nonsense. Abū-al-Hudhail replied: "And what do you say? Do you claim that Allah is able to torment a child, or do you merely say, 'This man (*i. e.* al-Naẓẓām) holds that view'?" He replied: "I hold that Allah has power to do this." And he said: "If he does that which he is able to do, namely torment a child, and oppress it, then the child must be an adult, intelligent, sinful, and deserving of the punishment which Allah imposes upon it. The evidences in themselves would be evidences of his justice." Abū-al-Hudhail said to him: "May your eyes weep. How can it be an act of virtue not to do what you can do along the line of oppression?" And al-Mirdār said: "Verily you have denied an opinion of my preceptor, and my preceptor was wrong." Bishr said to him: "How do you say?" And he replied: "I say that Allah has the power to oppress and to lie, and if he does this, he becomes an oppressive and a lying God." Bishr then said to him: "Does he deserve worship or not? If he deserves it, then worship is an act of praise toward the worshipped, and if he practises oppression, then he deserves blame and not praise. If, on the other hand, he does not deserve worship, how can he be a lord without it?"

Al-Ashbaḥ said to them: "I hold that Allah has the power 188 to oppress and to lie; and even if he oppresses and lies, he is upright, just as he has the power to do that which he knows he is not going to do. If [1] he does it, he knows he will do it." Al-Iskāfī said to him: "How does tyranny change into justice?" And he replied: "What do YOU say?" And he said: "I hold that if Allah commits tyranny and lying, his act does not exist, for it is done to an insane or defective man." [2] Ja'far ibn-Ḥarb said to him: "This amounts to saying that Allah has the power to oppress the insane, but no power to oppress the wise." At that time, the people differed over the reason for the different opinion held by each one of them. And when the turn to answer came to al-Jubbā'ī and his son, they refrained from answering in this matter, with advisedness. One of the followers of abū-Hāshim does not mention this question in his book. And he said: "If we are asked, 'Can what Allah is able to do in the line of oppression and lying occur?' we reply, 'This can occur, because if its occurrence were not possible, he would have no power over it, because power over the impossible is an impossibility.' And if he says, 'Is such an occurrence from Allah possible?' we answer, 'Its occurrence through him is not possible, because of the hatefulness of such a deed, the fact that Allah can do without it, and that he knows he can.' If one says, 'Tell us if his ability to oppress and lie is applied, what would be his own condition? Does the occurrence of his oppression prove his ignorance or his need?", we say, 'This is impossible because we have known him to be wise and rich.' And if he says, 'If oppression and lying come from him, is it then possible to say that this does not 189 prove his ignorance or his need?', we then say, 'he cannot be described in this manner because we know that oppression proves the ignorance of its author or his need.' And if he then says, 'Indeed, you do not answer the question asked of you regarding the evidence of the occurrence of oppression and lies through him who is ignorant and needy, either by yes or no,' we say, 'So you say'." These leaders of the Ḳadarīyah of our age acknowledge their inability, and the inability of their predecessors, to answer this question. If they should succeed in finding out the truth about it, they would accept the view of our followers that Allah has power over everything subject to power, and that everything which is subject to his power, if it comes from him, is not tyrannical on his part. And if they consider it impossible for him to lie, as our companions did, they would escape from the conclusions which were advanced against them in this matter. One of the excuses given by al-Jubbā'ī for not being able to answer this question by yes or no was something like this: If someone were to say: Tell me about the Prophet, if he lied, would that be or would it not be a proof that he was not a prophet? He claimed that the answer to this was impossible. This is private guess on his part. As for the Sunnites, they hold to the principle that the prophet was free from lying and oppression, and had no power to perform them. And the Mu'tazilah, aside from al-Naẓẓām and al-Aswārī, ascribed to Allah the power to oppress and lie. And they had to find an answer for the question of him who asked them about the occurrence of those things subject to his power that came from them (lying and oppression) if they were a proof of ignorance and need or not, by yes or no. Whoever of them tries to answer this, belies their principles in his answer. And praise be to Allah who saved us from this heresy of theirs which leads to such contradictions.

---

[1] *'alima* inserted here is a corruption of the text.

[2] A lie to an insane man is not considered a lie.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Many of the numerous Arabic works on the religion of Islam have come down to us only as titles. Among the most important on the great question of sects are the following:

Al-Subkī, in his *Ṭabaḳāt al-Shāfi'iyah* (ed. Cairo 1324 A. H., vol. i, pp. 252, 288; vol. ii, p. 171), mentions these Shāfī'i writers on this subject:

- Ḥusain ibn-'Alī ibn-Yazīd abū-'Alī al-Karabīsī (245/859), one of those best versed in the teachings of the heretics.
- Muḥammad ibn-Aḥmad ibn-Nasr abū-Ja'far al-Tirmidhī, versed in theology and tradition, wrote a work on the *Fundamental Differences of the People of Prayer.*
- Abū'l-Faḍl al-Balamī (329/941), wrote essays on this subject.

In verse:

- 'Abdallāh ibn-Muḥammad al-Nashī (293/906) wrote four thousand verses on philosophy and religious systems, sects and beliefs (Mas'ūdī, *Les Prairies d'Or*, vol. vii, p. 89).

Among the earliest polemical writers are:

- Abū-'Alī Aḥmad ibn-'Umar ibn-Rustah (d. 360 A. H.) who wrote a chapter on Arts and Religions of Arabs before Islām and the Schools in Islām. *Bibliotheca Geographicorum Arabicorum*, vol. vii, pp. 214-229 (sects on p. 217).
- Abū-Manṣūr 'Abd al-Ḳāhir ibn-Ṭāhir ibn-Muḥammad al-Baghdādī (d. 329/1037). (A list of his important works is given elsewhere.)
- Shuhfūr ibn-Ṭāhir ibn-Muḥammad al-Isfarā'inī (d. 1078). His manuscript in Berlin is practically a copy of Baghdādī's work.
- Abū-Muḥammad 'Alī ibn-Aḥmad ibn-Ḥazm (456/1064). *Kitāb al-Milal wa'l-Niḥal* (a book on differences and sects). Published in Cairo, with Shahrastānī's work printed on the margin.
- Abū'l-Fatḥ Muḥammad al-Shahrastānī. *Religious Sects and Philosophical Schools*, translated by Haarbrücker (Halle 1850).

This literature having reached its height with Shahrastānī, we will not mention here the numerous treatises which have appeared since. Of the above-mentioned works, one only is available in translation: that of Shahrastānī, *Religions-Partheien und Philosophen-Schulen*, translated by Haarbrücker. Parts of ibn-Ḥazm may be found translated by Prof. Friedländer, in the J. A. O. S., vols. xxviii and xxix.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The most important works on this subject by European scholars are the following:

E. Blochet:

Le Messianisme dans l'hétèrodoxie Musulmane, Paris, 1903.

A. Christensen:

Remarques critiques sur le Kitāb bayāni-l-adyān d'Abū-l-Ma'ālī; in *Le Monde Oriental*, vol. v, 1911, pp. 205 *et seq.*

Israel Friedländer:

The Heterodoxies of the Shüites, J. A, O. S., vols. xxviii and xxix. This article includes his translation of portions of ibn-Ḥazm. (New Haven, Conn., 1907.)

Ignaz Goldziher:

Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte der Shī'a und der Sunnitischen Polemik (in *Akad. der Wiss. Phil. Hist. klasse. Sitzungsb.*, vol. lxxviii, pp. 439-524.) (Vienna.)
Die Zahiriten (Leipzig, 1884).
Le Dénombrement des Sectes Mahometanes, in *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, vol. xxvi (Paris, 1892).
Review of Baghdādī's work, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. lxv, p. 349.
Vorlesungen über den Islam (Heidelberg, 1910). (Translated into English, *Mohammed and Islam*, New Haven, Conn., 1917.)

Hammer-Purgstall:

Tableau Généalogique des 73 sectes de l'Islam, in *Journal Asiatique*, 1st ser., vol. vi, pp. 321-335; vol. vii, pp. 32-46.

M. Horten:

Die Philosophischen Systeme der Spekulativen Theologen im Islam (Bonn, 1912).

S. Horovitz:

Uber den Einfluss der Griechischen Philosophie auf die Entwicklung der Kalam (Breslau, 1909).
Uber den Einfluss des Stoicismus auf die Entwicklung der Philosophie bei den Arabern, Z. D. M. G., vol. lvii, pp. 177-191.

J. B. L. J. Rousseau:

Mémoires sur les trois plus fameuses sectes du Musulmanisme (Paris, A. Nepven, 1818, ed. 75, p. 80).

Martin Schreiner:

Der Kalām in der Jüdischen Literatur, Revues des Études Juives, vol. xxix, p. 211 (Paris, 1894).
Beiträge zur Geschichte der Theologischen Bewegungen im Islām, Z. D. M. G., vol. lii, p. 463 and vol. liii, p. 51.
Zur Geschichte des Asa'ritentums, Actes du Troisiême Congrès Internationale des Orientalistes, sec. i vol. i, p. 77 (Leiden, 1891).

M. Steinschneider:

Die kanonische Zahl der Muhammedanischen Secten und die Symbolik der Zahl 70-73, Z. D. M. G., vol. iv, p. 145.

J. Wellhausen:

Religiös-Politischen oppositions-parteien im alten Islam. Kön. Gesellschaft d. Wissensch. Göttingen, p. 99. *Abhandl. Philol.-Hist. Klasse, N. F.*, vol. v, no. 2 (Berlin, 1901).

Wüstenfeld:

Der Imam al-Schāfi'ī und seine Anhänger. Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, vols. xxxvi, xxxvii (Göttingen, 1891).

INDEX

A

Abāḍīyah, 36
'Abdallāh ibn-al-Ḥasan ibn-al-Ḥusain, 63
'Abdallāh ibn-al-Waḍīn, 84
'Abdallāh ibn-abī-Aufī, 33
'Abdallāh ibn-Ḥarath al-Khuzā'ī, 85
'Abdallāh ibn-al-Zubair, 52, 59, 85, 115
'Abdallāh ibn-'Amr, 21
'Abdallāh ibn-'Amr ibn-al-'Ās, 22
'Abdallāh ibn-'Amr ibn-Ḥarb, 49
'Abdallāh ibn-Dajāh, 58
'Abdallāh ibn-Ḥammād al-Jubarī, 80
'Abdallāh ibn-Ḥubāb ibn-al-'Aratt, 77, 78
'Abdallāh-ibn-Ībād, 104, 107
'Abdallāh ibn-Ja'far, 71
'Abdallāh ibn-Jausha al-Ṭa'i, 82
'Abdallāh ibn-Kauwa, 77
'Abdallāh ibn-Maimūn al-Ḳadāḥ, 35
'Abdallāh ibn-Muslim-ibn-Ḳutaibah, 156, 179
'Abdallāh ibn-Muṭī' al-'Adawī, 52
'Abdallāh ibn-Nājiyah, 21
'Abdallāh ibn 'Umar, 33
'Abdallāh ibn-Wahab al-Rāsibī, 77, 80 ff., 92
'Abdallāh ibn-Yazīd, 21
'Abdallāh ibn-Yazīd al-Anṣārī, 52
'Abd-al-Ghaffār al-Fāris, 8
'Abd al-Ḳāhir, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 22, 45-7, 50, 61, 73, 94, 108, 115, 132, 175
'Abd al-Ḳais, 125
'Abd-al-Karīm ibn-'Ajrad, 94, 96, 102
'Abd-al-Malik ibn-Marwan, 54, 59, 86, 88, 91, 112, 113
'Abd-al-Raḥmān (bro. of 'Ā'ishah), 115
'Abd-al-Raḥmān al-Nīsābūri, 101
'Abd-al-Raḥmān ibn-Muḥammad ibn-al-Ash'ath, 113
'Abd-al-Raḥmān ibn-Muljim, 64, 93, 106
'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn-Ziyād ibn An'am, 21
'Abd al-Wāḥid ibn-Ziyād, 35
'Abd-Rabbihi al-Kabīr, 84, 87
'Abd Rabbihi al-Ṣaghīr, 84, 87
Abraham, 31, 151
'Abs, 54
Abstainers (from war), 84, 88, 98 ff., 101
al-Abtar, 45
abū-'Abdallāh, see al-Ḥasan ibn-Ṣālih ibn-Ḥaī al-Kūfī
abū-al-'Abbās al-Ḳalānisī, 165
abū-al-Hudhail Muḥammad ibn-al-Hudhail al-'Allāf, 68, 107, 125 ff., 148, 165, 173, 207 ff.
abū-al-Ḥusain al-Khaiyāt, see al-Khaiyāt
abū-al-Ruwandī, 147
abū-Baihas, 91
abū-Baihas Haiṣam ibn-'Āmir, 110
abū-Bakr, 31-3, 45, 46, 50, 106, 109
abū-Bakr al-Ṣiddiḳ, see abū-Bakr
abū-Bakr Muḥammad ibn-al-Ṭaiyib al-'Ash'arī, 138
abū-Bilāl Mirdās al-Khāriji, 92
abū-Fudaik, 90 ff.
abu-Ḥanīfah, 28, 39, 153
abū-Hāshim ibn-al-Jubba'ī, 37, 116, 118, 133, 165, 184, 190 ff., 209
abū-Hurairah, 21, 22, 33, 154

abū-Imāmah, 22
abū-Hāshim ‘Abdallah ibn-Muḥammad ibn-al-Hanifīyah, see Muḥammad ibn-al-Hanafīyah
abū-‘Īsā al-Warrāk, 68, 71
abū-Isḥāk, see al-Murtār
abū-Isḥāk al-Isafarā’inī, 8
abū-Isḥāk Ibrāhīm ibn-Saiyār, see al-Naẓẓām
abū-Ja‘far al-Mansūr, 62
abū-Kāmil, 36, 60
abū-Kārib al-Ḍarīr, 48
abū-Ḳāsim ‘Abdallāh ibn-Aḥmad ibn-Maḥmūd al-Banaḥī al-Ka‘bī, see al-Ka‘bī
abū-Ḳubais, 68
abū-Ḳudail (probably abū-Fudaik), 87 ff.
abū’l-Dardā, 22
abū’l-Jārūd, 43
abū-l-Hasan al-Ash‘arī, see al-Ash‘arī
abū-l-Julandī, 99
abū-l-Ṣaḥārā, 111
abū-l-Shamrākh, 91
abū-Mālik al-Haḍramī, 71
abū-Maryam al-Sa‘dī, 82
abū-Mas‘ūr, 155 ff.
abū-Muḥammad ‘Abdallāh ibn-‘Alī ibn-Ziyād al-Sumaidhī, see ibn-Ziyād
abū-Muḥammad ‘Abdallāh ibn-‘Umar, 22
abū-Muḥammad ibn-‘Alī ibn-‘Abdallāh ibn-‘Abbās ibn-al-Muṭṭalib, 49
abū-Mukarram, 104
abū-Mūsa al-‘Ash‘arī, 33, 146, 152
abū-Mūsā al-Murdār, see al-Murdār
abū-Muslim, 103, 104
abū-Rāshid, 83
abū-Sahl Bishr ibn Aḥmad ibn-Bashhār al-Isfarā’īnī, see al-Isfarā’īnī
abū-Salman, 21
abū-Sa‘īd al-Khidrī, 22
abū-Shimr al-Murji’, 37, 165
abū-Yahya Yūsuf ibn-Bashshar, see ibn-Bashshar
abū-Ya‘ḳūb al-Shaḥḥām, see al-Shaḥḥām
abū-Yūsuf, 177
abū-Zufar, 172
Adam, 56
al-‘Adawī, 122
‘Adī ibn-Ḥātim al-Ṭā‘ī, 78
Adīmawāt, the people of, 22
Adnānīyah, 182
Ahl al-Zāhir, 39
Aḥmad ibn-al-Ḥasan ibn-‘Abd al-Jabbār, 21
Aḥmad ibn-Fihr, 180
Aḥmad ibn-Naṣr al-Marwazī, 179
Aḥmad ibn-Shumaiṭ, 57, 58
al-Aḥnaf ibn-Ḳais, 57
al-Ahwāz, 85 ff., 121
‘Ailān, 54
‘Ā’ishah, 115, 122, 124
Ajāridah, 36, 75, 94, 96, 98
‘Akabah, night of, 154
al-‘Akhnas, 103
‘Akhnasīyah, 102, 103
‘Alī, 5, 6, 22, 30, 33 ff., 36, 43 ff., 48 ff., 60 ff., 64, 66, 75 ff., 80, 93, 95, 106, 122 ff., 154, 170
‘Alī al-Aswārī, see al-Aswārī
‘Alī ibn abī-Ṭālib, see ‘Alī
‘Alī ibn-Aḥmad ibn-Sa‘īd ibn-Ḥazm ibn-Ghālib ibn-Ṣāliḥ abū-Muḥammad, see ibn-Ḥazm
‘Alī ibn-al-Ḥusain Zain al-‘Ābidīn, 49, 64
‘Alī ibn-‘Īsa ibn-Hādiyān, 100
‘Alī ibn-Maithām, 71
‘Alī ibn-Mūsā al-Riḍā, 66
‘Alī Zarārah ibn-A‘yan, 71
‘Amārīyah, 60
‘Āmir ibn-Wāthilah al-Kinānī, 59
‘Amārīyah, 36
‘Amr ibn-al-‘Aṣī, 33, 80, 146
‘Amr ibn-Baḥr al-Jāḥiz, see al-Jāḥiz
‘Amr ibn-Ḥarmūz, 124
‘Amr ibn-Ṣā‘id, 99
‘Amr ibn-‘Ubaid ibn-Bāb, 34, 121, 122, 123 ff.
‘Ammār ibn-Yāsir, 123
‘Amr ibn-Yazīd al-Azdī, 99 ff.
‘Amrīyah, 37, 116, 123

Amwārīyah, 37
Anas ibn-Mālik, 22, 33
al-Anbār, 82
Arabs, 28, 109, 182 ff.
Aristotle, 183
Armenia, 54
‘Asa, 168
al-Aṣamm, 119, 170
A‘shā, 58
Aṣḥāb al-Maḳālāt, 206
Aṣḥāb Ṭa‘ah, 36, 105, 107
(abū-l-Ḥasan)
al-’Ash‘arī, 8, 45, 71, 75, 76, 138, 165, 189
al-Ashhab ibn-Bishr al-‘Uranī, 82
al-Ashbaḥ, 209
’Ashras ibn-‘Auf, 82
‘Aṣīyah, 168
Asmā’ ibn-Khārijah, 56
al-Aswad ibn-Zaid al-‘Anasī, 32
al-Aswārī, 137, 207, 210
Aswārīyah, 116
‘Aṭawīyah, 88
‘Aṭīyah ibn-al-Aswad al-Ḥanafī, 87 ff., 94
’Attāb ibn-Warḳa’ al-Tamīmī, 113
’Aufīyah, 111
al-Auẓā‘ī, 22, 39
Azāriḳah, 36, 82-4, 86 ff., 91, 111, 119 ff., 135, 195
al-Azd, 57, 86

B

Badr, battle of, 69, 170
Baghdad, 66
al-Baghdādī, see ‘Abd al-Ḳāhir
Baghdādīyūn, 187
Bahshamīyah, 37, 116, 190
Baihasīyah, 92, 99, 110 ff.
al-Bakir, 64, 65
Bakr, 35, 54
Bakrīyah, 38, 41
Bakirīyah, 35, 36
Banū-l-’Abbās, 103
Banū-Azd, 124
Banū-Dabbah, 124
Banū Ḥanīfah, 58
Banū Isrā’īl, see Jews
Banū-Khuzā‘ah, 180
Banū-Kinānah, 182
Banū Ḳuraiẓah, 80
Banū-Shaibān, 112 ff., 113
Banū-Tamīm, 123
Banū Umaīyah, 46, 104
Banū Yashkur, 76
Bashhār ibn-Burd, 60, 61
al-Baṣrah, 34, 56, 57, 62, 78, 85 ff., 91 ff., 115, 120, 136, 154
Baṣrīyah, 139
Baṣrīyūn, 186 ff.
Bāṭinīyah, 29, 35, 65, 66
Battle of the Camels, 48, 78, 122 ff.
Bayān ibn-Sim‘ān, 49
Bayānīyah, 29, 36, 49
Bishr ibn-Marwān, 112
Bishr ibn-al-Mu‘tamar, 134, 162 ff., 165, 173, 207
Bishrīyah, 116, 162
Buddhism, 12
al-Bukhārī, 45
Burghūnīyah, 37
Burhānite Dualists, 141
Būshanj, 100
Bust, 101
Butrīyah, 35, 45
Buwaihids, 190

C

Cairo, 13
Christians, 12, 21, 79, 130, 147 ff., 172 ff., 178, 189
Companions, 22, 60, 61, 65, 153, 155, 157, 161
Cordova, 11

D

Daḥḥākīyah, 110
Dahrī, 129 ff.
Dahrīyah, 125 ff., 178
Ḍarār, 32
Ḍarār ibn-‘Amr, 35
Ḍarārīyah, 30, 35, 169
(Ḍirārrīyah, 38, 41)
al-Dhar, 59
al-Dhimmīyah, 190
Dhi Salam, 56

Dhubyān, 54
Dhū'l-Nūnain, 50
Dhū'l-Thudyah, 77, 81
Dualists, 136, 141 ff.
al-Dujail (Little Tigris), 114
Dūlāb al-Ahwāz, 77, 85, 86
Duwaibiyah ibn-Wabrah al-Bajadī, 80

F

Fadak, 32
Faḍl al-Ḥadathī, 137
al-Faiyāḍ ibn Khalī al-Azdī, 80
Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, 8
Faljard, 99
Fārūḳ, 50
Farwah ibn-Naufal al-Ashja'ī, 82
Fāṭimah, 154
Followers of the Camel, 33, 75, 78, 81, 122 ff.
Followers of Obedience, see Aṣḥāb Ṭa'ah
Friedländer, 7, 11
al-Fūṭī, see Hishām ibn-'Amr

G

Gabriel, 27
Ghailān al-Dimashḳī, 33, 119
Ghalafah al-Taimī, 82
Ghassānīyah, 37
Ghazālah, 112-15
al-Ghazzāl, see Wāṣil ibn-'Ata'
Ghulāt, 5, 34-36, 49, 55, 65, 75, 97, 105, 116
Greeks, 12, 32

H

Ḥabīb ibn-'Āṣīm al-'Audī, 81
Ḥafṣ ibn-abī-l-Mikdām, 105
Ḥafṣīyah, 36, 105
Haiṣam al-Shari, 100
al-Haitham ibn-Khārijah, 21
Hājir, Mt., 62, 63
al-Ḥajjāj ibn-Yūsuf, 86 ff., 112 ff.
Ḥakaḳīyah, 38
al-Ḥakam ibn-al-'Āṣi, 154
Halūla, Fort of, 112
Ḥalūlīyah, 36
Hamadhān, 45, 54, 58, 77
Ḥammād 'Ajrad, 61
Ḥamrān Ḳaumaṭ, 35
Ḥamzah ibn-Akrak al-Khārijī, 97, 98 ff.
Ḥamzīyah, 36, 96, 98
Ḥanbalite, 6
Ḥanifite, 6
Ḥarbīyah, 49
Ḥārithah ibn-Badr al-Fadānī, 85
Hārith ibn-Mazīd al-Ibādī, 106 ff.
al-Ḥārith ibn-'Umair, 112
Ḥārithīyah, 36, 105 ff.
Ḥarjarāyah, 82
al-Ḥarrah, 46
Hārūn al-Rashid, 99, 177
Ḥarūra, 77
Ḥarūrīyah, 77, 112
al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, 34, 119, 121
al-Ḥasan ibn-'Alī, 43, 44, 47, 48, 57, 64, 123
al-Ḥasan ibn-Ṣāliḥ ibn-Ḥaī al-Kūfī, 45
Hāshim al-Auḳas, 124
Ḥaushah, 124
Ḥautharah ibn-Wadā' al-'Asadī, 82
Ḥāyiṭīyah, 116, 37?
Hazzān, 54
al-Ḥijāz, 28, 52
Ḥimārīyah, 37, 116
Ḥimrun, 63
Hindu, 12
Hirāt, 99 ff.
Hishām ibn-'Abd al-Malik, 35, 46
Hishām ibn-'Amr al-Fūṭī, 165 ff.
Hishām ibn-al-Ḥakam al-Rāfiḍi, 36, 67-71, 73, 136, 144
Hishām ibn-Sālim al-Jawalīḳī, 36, 67, 70, 71, 73
Hishām ibn-'Ubaidallāh al-Rāzī, 177
Hishāmīyah, 36, 60, 67, 116, 165
Holy Land, 31
al-Ḥudaibiyah, day of, 79, 154
Hudhailīyah, 37, 116, 125
Ḥurairīyah, 35
al-Ḥusain ibn 'Alī, 43, 44, 46-8, 52-4, 58, 59, 64, 123

al-Ḥusain ibn-Numair al-Sukūtī, 9, 52, 54
Ḥurḳūṣ ibn-Zuhair al-Bajalī al-'Uranī, 77, 80, 81, 92

I

'Ibād ibn-Akhḍar al-Tamīmī, 93
Ibāḍīyah, 29, 81, 104 ff., 106 ff., 109, 120, 129
al-Iskāfī, 209
Ibn-'Abbās, 33, 59, 123
Ibn-'Abbād, 190
ibn-abī-al-Salt, 98
ibn-abi-Dā'ūd, 179 ff.
ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah, see Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah
ibn-al-Ikhshīd, 200
ibn-al-Jubbā'ī, see abū-Hāshim ibn-al-Jubbā'ī
ibn-al-Rawandi, 68
ibn-al-Ṣalāh, 7
ibn-al-Zaiyāt, 179 ff.
ibn-Arwā, 50
ibn-Bāb, see 'Amr ibn-Ubaid
ibn-Bashshār (abū-Yaḥya Yūsuf), 47, 99
ibn-Bassām, 182
ibn-Ḥāyit, 137
ibn-Ḥazm, 5, 11, 12
ibn-Khallikān, 7, 8
ibn-Khuzaimah ibn-Mudrakah ibn-Ilyās ibn-Mudhar, 182
ibn-Mubashshir, see Ja'far ibn-Mubashshir
ibn-Sabā, 34
ibn-Shihab, 55
ibn-Yazīd ibn Unais, 36
ibn-Ziyād, 21, 52, 54, 83, 92
Ibrāhīm, 109 ff.
Ibrāhīm ibn-'Abdallāh, 62, 63
Ibrāhīm ibn-Mālik al-Ashtar, 53, 54, 57
Ibrāhīmīyah, 36, 110
'Īdhaj, 86
Idrīs ibn-'Abdallāh, 62, 63
Imāmīyah, 5, 30, 34 ff., 43, 44, 60, 70, 72 ff.
'Imrān ibn-Ḥiṭṭān al-Sadwīsī, 92 ff.
al-'Irāk, 46, 52, 54, 55, 86, 112, 152
'Īsā ibn-Maryam, 31
'Isa ibn-Mūsā, 62, 63
'Isa ibn-Ṣābiḥ, see Murdār
'Īsawīah, 27
al-Isfarā'inī, 8, 21
Isḥāḳ ibn-Suwaid al-'Adawī, 122
Isḥāḳīyah, 38
Ishmael, 31
al-Iskāfī (Muḥammad ibn-'Abdallāh), 137, 175 ff., 209
Iskāfīyah, 116, 175
Ismā'īl ibn-Ja'far, 65
Ismā'īl ibn-'Abbās, 21
Ismā'īlīyah, 5, 36, 60, 65
Ispahan, 28
Ithna 'Asharīyah, see Twelvers

J

Jābir, 22
Jābir ibn-'Abdallāh al-Anṣārī, 33, 65
Ja'd ibn-Dirham, 33
Ja'far al-Ṣādiḳ, 66
Ja'far ibn-Ḥarb, 125, 137, 173, 175, 209
Ja'far ibn-Mubashshir, 173 ff.
Ja'far ibn-'Umar, 54, 65
Ja'farīyah, 116, 173
al-Jāḥīz, 68, 124, 137, 147, 153, 179, 180 ff.
al-Jāḥīzīyah, 37, 116, 180
Jahm ibn-Safwan, 35, 37, 126 ff.
Jahmīyah, 23, 30, 35, 37, 38, 41
Jaḥẓah, 182
Jahzīyah, 113, 114
Jamī' ibn-Jusham al-Kindī, 80
Janāhīyah, 36
Jarīrīyah, 44
Jārūdīyah, 35, 43-5
al-Jazīrah, 54, 81
Jerusalem, 31
Jesus, 189 (see also 'Isā ibn-Maryam)
Jews, 12, 21, 22, 28, 130, 147 ff., 173
Jīraft Kirmīn, 87
Jīwaih ibn-Ma'bad, 99
al-Jubbā'ī, 118, 125, 133, 137, 165, 183 ff., 189 ff., 209

Jubbā'īyah, 37
    (Jubābīyah, 116)
Jūzajān, 47

K

al-Ka'bī, abū-Kāsim 'Abdallāh ibn-Aḥmad ibn-Maḥmūd al Banahī, 27, 28, 75, 76, 117, 118 ff., 159, 161, 180 ff., 184, 186 ff.
Ka'bīyah, 37, 116, 186 ff.
Kābul, 123
Kadarites, see Ḳadarīyah
Ḳadarīyah, 5, 22, 23, 33, 37-9, 41, 72, 95, 96, 98 ff., 116, 117, 121, 124, 127, 133, 135, 137, 155 ff., 162, 176 ff., 179, 183
al-Ḳādisīyah, 32, 37, 63, 95-6, 156
al-Ḳaḥdīyah, 71
Ḳahistān, 98, 101
Kahṭānīyah, 182
Kais, 54
Kaisān, 48
Kaisānīyah, 5, 34-6, 43, 47, 48, 51, 58-60, 73
Kaisūm ibn-Salamah al-Juhanī, 80
al-Ḳalānisī, 138
Kāmilīyah, 36, 60, 61
al-Karabīyah, 48
Karbelā', 47-9, 53, 64
Karrāmīyah, 27, 35, 38, 41, 72
Karūkh, 100
Kāṣim al-Dimashkī, 206
Kaskar, 113
Ḳatādah, 22
Ḳaṭarī ibn-al-Fujā'ah, 86 ff.
Kathīr al-Munauwa, 45
al-Ḳaṭīf, 89
Ḳaṭī'īyah, 60, 66, 72
al-Khaīyāt (abū-al-Ḥusain), 126, 128, 147, 166, 172, 184 ff.
Khaiyāṭīyah, 37, 116, 184 ff.
Khalaf, 97
Khalafīyas, 97, 100
al-Khālidī, 37, 119
Khālid ibn-'Abdallāh, 21
Kharijites, see Khawārīj
Khaulān, 54
Khawārīj, 5, 22, 23, 29, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 41, 46, 50, 74 ff., 77, 80 ff., 85 ff., 88, 96, 97, 100, 104, 113 ff., 122, 128 ff., 129, 137, 174, 197
Khāzimīyah, 36, 94 ff., 98 ff.
Khuraim ibn-Fātik al-Asadī, 113
Khurasan, 27, 35, 38, 47, 98, 100, 101
    (Khorasan), 86
Kinānīyah, 182
Kirman, 85, 87
    (Kurman), 97, 98, 101
Ḳiṭa'īyah, 36
al-Kufah, 44, 46, 47, 52-8, 63, 77, 80, 112-4, 154
Kumis, 87
Kuraib ibn-Murrah, 83, 93
Kuraish, 32
Kuthaiyir, 49, 50

M

Ma'bad al-Juhanī, 33, 101, 119, 121
Ma'badīyah, 36, 102, 103
al-Madā'in, 52, 58, 82, 113
al-Madā'inī, 183
al-Madhār, 58
Madhhij, 54
al-Madīnah, 31, 32, 46, 63, 64, 65, 154, 177
al-Ma'dūmīyah, 185
Maghrib, 62, 63
Magians, 12, 22, 35, 37, 130, 147, 173, 206
Mahdī, 44, 49, 55, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 66
al-Māhīn, 54
Maimun, 96
    (not leader of Maimūnīyah, 109
Maimūnīyah, 29, 36, 37, 75, 95, 110
Majhūlīyah, 36, 97
Makrumīyah, 104
Mālik, 39, 177
Mālikite, 6
Ma'lūmīyah, 36, 97 ff.
Mamṭūrah, 66, 72
al-Ma'mūn (caliph), 35, 101, 177, 179
Manicheans, 139, 145

al-Manṣūr, see abū-Ja'far al-Manṣūr
Manṣūrīyah, 36
Marādis al-Khārijī, 76
Marīsīyah, 37
Marwān ibn-al-Ḥakam, 124
Mary, 189
Māsīdhān, 82
Masma' ibn-Ḳadalī, 77
Mas'ūd ibn-Ḳais, 100
al-Mauṣil (Mosul), 54
al-Mawāyīnī, 112
Mecca, 28, 31, 48, 59, 62, 63, 68, 107
Michael, 27
Miḳlāṣ al-Azraḳ, 88
Millat al-Islām, 25, 27
al-Mirdād, 125 ff., 208
Mu'ādh ibn-Jarīr, 82
Mu'ammar, 118 ff., 124, 137, 157, 159 ff., 202
Mu'ammarīyah, 116
Mu'āwīyah, 5, 33, 47, 65, 76, 79 ff., 82, 122, 170
Mu'āwīyah ibn-Isḥāḳ ibn-Yazīd ibn-Ḥārithah, 46
Mubārakīyah, 36, 60, 66
al-Mughīrah ibn-Sa'īd al-'Ijlī, 62, 63
al-Mughīrah ibn-Shu'bah, 82
Mughīrīyah, 29, 36, 63
Muḥakkimah, First, 36, 76, 81 ff., 92
al-Muhallab ibn-abi-Ṣufrah, 57, 86
Muḥammad, 1, 6, 22, 23, 27-31, 59, 62, 70, 79, 88, 140, 146 ff., 154, 156, 161, 179, 181
Muḥammad Badr, 13
Muḥammad ibn-'Abdallāh al-Iskāfī, see al-Iskāfī
Muḥammad ibn-'Abdallāh ibn-al-Ḥasan ibn-'Alī ibn-abi-Tālib, 44, 62, 63, 64
Muḥammad ibn-al-Ash'ath al-Kindī, 57, 58
Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥanafīyah, 35, 48, 49, 51, 52, 55, 59
Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḥasan, 66, 176ff.
Muḥammad ibn-'Alī, 64
Muḥammad ibn-al-Ḳāsim, 44
Muḥammad ibn-al-Nu'mān al-Rāfiḍī, 72
Muḥammad ibn-'Amr, 21
Muḥammad ibn-Ismā'īl, 65, 66
Muḥammad ibn-Ismā'īl al-Bukhāri, see al-Bukhārī
Muḥammad ibn-Shabīb al-Baṣrī, 37-119
Muḥammad ibn-Ṭāhir ibn-'Abdallāh ibn-Ṭāhir, 35
Muḥammad ibn-'Umar, 44
Muḥammadīyah, 35, 44, 60, 62, 64
Mujassimah, 23, 27, 30
Mukarramīyah, 36
Mukarrān, 97 ff.
Muḳaṣṣidūn, 160
al-Mukhtār ibn-abi-'Ubaid al-Thakafī (known also as abū-Isḥāḳ), 47, 48, 51-8
al-Murdār (Isā ibn-Sabīh, abū-Mūsā al-Murdār), 171 ff., 175
Murdārīyah, 116, 170
Murjiites, see Murjīyah
Murjīyah, 5, 22, 37, 38, 41, 198
Mus'ab ibn-al-Zubair, 56-8
Mūsā ibn-Ja'far, 65, 66, 72, 73
Musailamah, 32
al-Mūsawīyah, 36, 60, 71
Mushabbihah, 23
Muslim ibn-'Abs ibn-Kuraiz ibn-Ḥabīb ibn-'Abd-Shams, 85
Muslim ibn-Ahwaz al-Māzinī, 47
Muslim ibn-al-Ḥajjāj, 45
Mustadrikah, 37
al-Mustaurid ibn-Alḳamah al-Tamīmī, 82
al-Mu'taṣim, 177
Mutawakkil, 180
Mu'tazilah, 5, 29, 34, 41, 106, 116 ff., 119, 125 ff., 131 ff., 135, 137, 139, 147 ff., 149, 161 ff., 166, 170 ff., 176 ff., 182, 184 ff., 186 ff., 191, 201, 203, 205, 210
al-Muṭṭariḥ, 89
Mūwaisīyah, 37, 116

N

Nabhān, 54

Nāfi‘ ibn-al-Azraḳ al-Ḥanafī, 83 ff., 86 ff.
Nahāwand, 32
Nahd, 54
al-Nahrawān, battle of, 77, 82
Najadāt, 36, 75, 76, 87, 91, 120, 174
Najd, 63
Najdah ibn-‘Amir al-Ḥanafī, 87-90
Najjārīyah, 23, 30, 34, 37, 41, 137, 169
Najrān, 79
Nīsāpūr, 7
    (Nīsābūr), 101
Naṣr ibn-al-Ḥajjāj, 154
Naṣr ibn-Bashshār, see ibn-Bashshār
Naṣr ibn-Ḥārimah al-‘Ansī, 46
Nāwisīyah, 35, 60
al-Naẓẓām abū-Isḥāk Ibrāhīm ibn-Saiyār, 70, 124, 135 ff., 165, 171, 173, 175, 183, 186 ff., 206 ff., 210
Nazzāmīyah, 135 ff.
Niẓāmīyah, 37
    (Naẓẓāmīyah), 116
al-Nu‘āt, 54
al-Nukhailah, 82

P

Persia, 36, 52, 85 ff.
Persians, 32
Prophet, The, see Muḥammad

R

Raḍwā, Mt., 48, 50, 51
Raḍwā, Pass of, 59
Rafi ibn-Laith ibn-Naṣr ibn-Saiyār, 101
al-Rai, 34, 37, 87, 176
al-Rāshid, 65, 101, 104
Rashīdīyah, 36, 104
Rāshid al-Ṭawīl, 88, 90 ff.
Rawāfid, 23, 34-6, 38, 43, 47
    (Rāfidīyah), 29, 39, 46, 71
    (Rāfīdah), 41, 55, 60, 61, 73, 106, 170
Rawandīyah, 49
Rūh Zinbā‘, 112
Rukānah ibn-Wā’il al-Arjī, 80
al-Ruwandī, 165

S

Sābāt al-Madā’in, 34, 47
Sabbābiyah, 34, 55, 64
Sābūr, 86
Sa‘d ibn-abī-Waḳḳās, 32
Sa‘d ibn-Ḳufr, 82
Sa‘d ibn-Mu‘ādh, 80
Sa‘d ibn-Mujālid al-Saiba‘ī, 80
Sa‘d ibn-‘Ubādah al-Khazrajī, 32
Safwān-Anṣārī, 61
Saḥāmīyah, 37
Sa‘īd ibn-al-‘Āsi, 154
Saiyid al-Ḥimyarī, 50, 51
Sajāḥ, 32
al-Ṣāliḥī, 118 ff., 184
Sāliḥ ibn-Mishraḥ al-Khārijī, 111
Sāliḥ ibn-Mishraḥ al-Tamīmī, 111
Ṣāliḥīyah, 111
    (Same as Khawārij on p. 113)
Ṣaliḥ Ḳubbah, followers of, 37, 116
Salt ibn-‘Uthmān, 98
Saltīyah, 98
Samaritans, 148
Samarḳand, 101
Sammāk ibn-Ḥarb, 45
Sanān al-Ju‘fī, 47
Satan, 61, 64
Sawād al-Kūfah, 82
Sha‘bah, 100
Shabīb ibn-Yazīd al-Shaibānī, 111 ff.
al-Shabībīyah, 111, 115
al-Shāfi‘ī, 39, 153, 174 ff., 177
Shafi‘ite, 6
al-Shaḥḥām, 183 ff.
al-Shaḥḥāmīyah, 116, 183
Shahrastānī, 5, 11, 35
Shaibān ibn-Salamah al-Khārijī, 103
Shaibānīyah, 103, 104
Shaiṭan al-Ṭāḳ, 36, 71, 72
Shaiṭānīyah, 36, 60, 72
Shamītīyah, 60
Shārikān, 28
Shārikānīyah, 28
Shibt ibn-Rab‘ī, 77

Shiite, 1, 5, 6, 129, 137
Shuaib, 96
Shu‘aibīyah, 36, 95
Shuhfur ibn-Tāhir, 10
Shumaiṭīyah, 36
Shurāh, 76
Ṣifātīyah, 5, 184, 203
Siffīn, 33, 60, 76, 77, 122
Sifrīyah, 36, 111, 120
    (See Sufrīyah)
Sijistān, 81, 88, 94, 98, 100, 101
Sophists, 136
Subkī, 7, 8
Sufain ibn-al-Abrad al-Kalbī, 114
Sufrīyah, 91 ff., 112
    (See Sifrīyah)
Ṣufyān ibn-al-Abrad al-Kalbī, 87
Suhail ibn-‘Amr, 79
Sulaimān ibn-Jarīr al-Zaidī, 44, 45
Sulaimānīyah, 35, 44, 45
Sunnites, 1, 5, 6, 9, 23, 29, 94, 97, 103, 124, 129, 135, 138, 171
Surākah ibn-Mirdās al-Bāriḳī, 56
Syria, 32, 52, 90, 112, 170

T

Ṭabaristān, 87
Ṭāhir ibn-al-Ḥusain, 101
al-Ṭā’if, 59
Taim ‘Adī, 82
Ṭālaḳān, 44
Ṭalḥah, 95
Ṭalḥah ibn-Fahd, 99, 122, 124
Tall-Mauzan, 81
Tamāmīyah, 116
Ṭarāiḳīyah, 38
Ṭārif, 58
Taumanīyah, 37
Tauwaj, 93
Tha’ālibah, 102, 104
Tha’ālibah Khawārij, 101
Tha’labah ibn-Mashkān, 102
Thamāmah ibn-Ashras al-Numairī, 177 ff., 181
Thamāmīyah, 177
Thanawīyah, 12
Thaubānīyah, 37
al-Thaurī, 39
Thu‘al, 54
Thumāmīyah, 37
Tigris, 62
Ṭulaiḥah, 32
Twelvers, 36, 60, 66

U

‘Ubād ibn-al-Ḥuṣain al-Ḥaiṭī, 83
‘Ubād ibn-Sulaimān al-‘Amrī (‘Umari?), 167 ff.
‘Ubaidallāh ibn-al-Hirr al-Ju‘afī, 53, 57
‘Ubaidah ibn-Hilāl al-Yashkurī, 87
‘Ubaidallāh ibn-Ma‘mar al-Taimī, 57
‘Ubaidallāh ibn-Ziyād, see ibn-Ziyād
‘Ubaid ibn-abī-l-Mukhārik al-Mutannabī, 113
Ubai ibn-Ka‘b, 22
Uḥud, 170
‘Ukbah ibn-‘Amir al-Juḥanī, 33
‘Umān, 54, 81
‘Umar, 44, 45, 50, 106, 154
‘Umar al-Fārūḳ, 154
‘Umar ibn-Sa‘d, 53
‘Umarīyah, 37
Ummat al-Islām, 12, 27-32
Urwah ibn-Ḥudair, 76
‘Utbah ibn-‘Ubaid al-Khaulānī, 80
‘Uthmān, 33, 45, 75, 81, 95, 154, 169
‘Uthmān ibn-‘Affān, 88, 106
‘Uthmān ibn-Ma‘mūn, 86
‘Uthmān ibn-‘Ubaidallāh ibn-Ma‘mar al-Tamīmī, 85 ff.

W

Wādi al-Sibā‘, 124
Wahb ibn-Baḳīyah, 21
Wāḳifah, 36, 110
    (Wāḳifīyah), 119
Walīd ibn-Maslamah, 22
al-Walīd ibn-‘Uḳbah, 154
Wāṣil ibn-‘Aṭā al-Ghazzāl, 34, 35, 119, 121 ff., 170
Wāsilīyah, 37, 116, 119
al-Waṣy, 50

al-Wāthiḳ, 177, 179
Wāthilah ibn-al-Asḳa‘, 22

Y

Yaḥya ibn-Aktham, 177
Yaḥya ibn-Zaid, 47
Ya‘ḳūb, 46
Ya‘ḳūbīyah, 45
al-Yamāmah, 88, 90
al-Yaman, 52, 81, 90
Ya‘mur ibn-‘Ubaidallāh ibn-Ma‘mar al-Maimī, 91
Yazīd ibn-‘Alī ibn-al-Husain ibn-‘Alī ibn-abi-Ṭālib, 47, 48
Yazīd ibn-al-Muhallab, 87
Yazīd ibn-Āṣim al-Muḥādhi, 76
Yazīd ibn-Mu‘āwīyah, 47, 48, 52, 59, 92
Yazīdīyah, 29, 36, 37, 74, 105
Yūnus ibn-‘abd-al-Raḥmān al-Kummī, 36, 66, 72
Yūnusīyah, 36, 37, 60, 72
Yūsuf ibn-‘Um-Thaḳafī, 46, 47

Z

al-Za‘farānī, 34
Za‘farānīyah, 37
Zaḥāf ibn-Raḥar al-Ṭā’ī, 83, 93
Zāhirīyah, 148
Zaid ibn-‘Alī ibn-al-Ḥasan ibn-‘Alī ibn-abi-Ṭālib, 46
Zaid ibn-‘Alī ibn-al-Ḥusain ibn-‘Alī ibn-abi-Ṭālib, 35
Zaidīyah, 5, 30, 34-6, 43, 45, 46, 53, 60, 72, 73
Zaranj, 100
Zarārah ibn-A‘yun, 36
Zarārīyah, 36, 60, 71
Zindiks, 173, 177, 178
Ziyād-ibn-’Abd-al-Raḥmān, 104
Ziyād ibn-Abīhi, 82
Ziyād ibn-al-Aṣfar, 91
Ziyād ibn-Kharrāsh al-‘Ijlī, 82
Ziyādīyah, 104
al-Zubair, 95, 122, 124
Zur‘ah ibn-Muslim al-‘Āmirī, 92
Zurḳān, 70